FAḌL AL-BĀRĪ

COMMENTARY ON THE

ṢAḤĪḤ AL-BUKHĀRĪ

فضل الباری صحیح البخاری

IDĀRAH ‘ULŪM-I-SHAR‘ĪYYAH
KARACHI (PAKISTAN)

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

تركت فيكم أمرين لن تضلوا ما تمسكتم بهما كتاب الله وسنتي

THE
ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE

FAḌL AL-BĀRĪ

COMMENTARY ON THE

ṢAḤĪḤ AL-BUKHĀRĪ

DISCOURSES OF

'ALLAMAH SHABBIR AHMAD 'UTHMANI

COMPILED

By

OADI 'ABDUR RAHMAN

VOL. 1

TRANSLATION
BUREAU OF TRANSLATION AND COMPILATION

IDĀRAH 'ULŪM-I-SHAR'İYYAH
KARACHI (PAKISTAN)

قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰہِ صَلَّی اللّٰہُ عَلَیْہِ وَسَلَّمَ نَضَّرَ اللّٰہُ اِمْرَئً سَمِعَ مِنَّا شَیْئًا فَبَلَّغَہٗ کَمَا سَمِعَہٗ

The translation of this Tradition is as under:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) says. God will make prosperous that person who hears something from us and conveys it to others, as he has heard it.—(from US).

The Series of Chapters on Traditions

The treatise Fadh-al-Bari, the English Commentary on Sahih-al-Bukhari is expected to comprise ten volumes. The Idarah has the honour to present the first volume, which begins with the "Book on Revelation" and ends with Chapter 49 and Tradition No. 65. It will be followed by the Second Volume beginning with Chapter 50 and Tradition No. **66** and ending with Chapter 240 and Tradition No. 338. The Second Volume will cover "Book on knowledge", "Book on Ablution", "Book on Bath", "Book on Menses", and "Book on TAYMMUM" including the related Traditions and their elucidation. Then would follow the third volume starting with "Book on Prayers".

IDARAH

All rights of printing and publishing reserved by the Idarah-e-Ulum-e-Shariah, Karachi.

May God bless this enterprise with ultimate success

Imam Muhammad Bin Ismail was a living miracle of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) and an eternal proof of the truth of Islam. His world-famous treatise on the Holy Prophet's traditions, Sahih Bukhari, presents a complete picture of the life of the Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him). In fact it is a very strong fortress of faith which cannot be assailed or demolished by forces enemical to Islam, such as atheism, secularism, communism, or for that matter any kind od "ism" repugnant to Divine supremacy.

During the last twelve hundred years the Islamic **Millat** has spared no effort to explain to the mankind the truth embodied in Sahih Bukhari and hundreds of people have devoted their life time to the understanding of and expounding this truth.

Commentaries on Sahih Bukhari have so far been generally written in Arabic. But times have now changed and there is a general demand for bringing out an English translation of a recognised Commentary on the Sahih so that the message of Islam may also be conveyed to those who speak or understand English. Such a translation becomes all the more necessary in the face of thechallenge thrown out by anti-Islam elements now more active than ever before. It has therefore become obligatory for us to make the world aware of the actions and commands of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). The mankind has already experimented with various ways of life, but has failed to find spiritual solace. Sahih Bukhari shows the way that immediately leads to spiritual peace as well as material progress. It embodies a complete code of life and is the most effective means of propagating Islam. We are thankful to Almighty God that He has enabled us to bring out an English version of a well-known Commentary on Sahih Bukhari for the benefit of the people of Europe and of other English speaking countries as well as for those who are admirers of western materialism. This Commentary was written by Allama Shabbir Ahmad Uthmani in Arabic entitled "Fateh-al-Mulhim". The towering scholarly personality of the Allama is well known throughout the Islamic world. His deep insight, masterly approach to intricate issues, and thorough research are acknowledged by all..Fadhl-al-Bari is our annotated version of this Commentary, with the fullest possible elucidation of important points and full references of all Quranic and other quotations.

It is for the first time that a Commentary on Sahih Bukhari is being presented to the world in English. It will not only make known to English speaking and English knowing peoples of various countries as to how the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) passed his days and nights as also his character and personality but will also prove an effective weapon to defend Islam against the ever-rushing onslaught of atheism and communism. It will also help remove doubts and misgivings spread out by the opponents of Islam.

So far as our academic and technical requirements are concerned the Idara is well equipped with books on Traditions, Commentaries thereon, books on the life and character of narrators of Traditions, dictionaries and books on other related technical subjects. But it is not possible to accomplish such a gigantic task on a commercial basis. The Idarah therefore invites those who in their hearts feel the urge for the propagation of Islam to join it in its journey to the sacred destination. This appeal is aimed at accomplishing this task to a good end in the same goodly manner in which it has been started, so that it might not be left unfinished for lack of necessary means.

May Allah reward in this world and in the Hereafter our co-travellers along with us for the services rendered for the cause of Hadith.

FADL AL-BARI

COMMENTARY ON THE

SAHIH AL-BUKHARI

Volume I

FADL AL-BARI

Commentary on the

SAHIH AL-BUKHARI

LIST OF CONTENTS

S. No.	*Subject*	*Pages*
1.	Foreword by Dr. Ishtīāq Hussain Qureshi	24
2.	*Faḍl al-Bārī* in English: Ḥakīm al-Islām Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṭayyib, Rector, Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband ...	26
3.	Incentive for translating the *Faḍl al-Bārī* into English	33
4.	How man can attain immortality	35
5.	Role of the *Ummah* in guarding Islam	36
6.	Our present responsibility	36
7.	Background of the *Faḍl al-Bārī* by Mawlānā Muḥammad Yaḥyā Siddīqī, Son-in-law of the late Shaykh al-Islam 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī	38
8.	Ḥakīm al-Islam Mawlānā Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyib, Rector, Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband (India)	41
9.	Shaykh al-Ḥadīth Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyā ...	43
10.	Panegyric by the learned scholar, sincere friend, and excellent poet Al-Shaykh Al-Sayyid Maḥmūd bin Nazīr Al-Ṭarāzī Al-Madanī (Lecturer at the Masjid-e-Nabawī, Madīnah Munawwarah)	44
11.	Mawlānā Shams al-Ḥaq Afghānī, formerly Head of the Department of Tafsīr, Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband ...	48
12.	Mawlānā Muḥammad Yūsuf Binnawrī, Rector, Jāmi'ah 'Arabiyah, New Town, Karachi	49
13.	Mawlānā Muftī Muḥammad Shafī', Rector, Dār al-'Ulūm, Karachi	51
14.	Mawlānā 'Abd al-Raḥmān, Rector, Jāmi'ah Ashrafiyah, Lahore	52
15.	Mawlānā Muḥammad Salīm Allāh Khān, Rector, Jāmi'ah Fāruqiyah, Karachi	54

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

16. Shaykh al-Islam Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī. A short biographical sketch by Professor Anwār al-Ḥasan Sherkotī 56
17. Family background 56
18. Formal education and graduation 57
19. Dabhel 58
20. Participation in Islamic Conference of Makkah ... 58
21. Journey to Ḥyderabād 59
22. Back to Deoband 59
23. The 'Allāmāh's participation in the Pakistan Movement 59
24. Death 61
25. Tributes paid to the 'Allāmāh 62
26. 'Allāmāh's works 64
27. The chapters in relation to the *Aḥādīth* fixed by Imām Bukhārī, his interpretations, and 'Allāmāh 'Uthmānī ... 65
28. Main traits of the *Aḥādīth* and 'Allāmāh 'Uthmānī ... 66
29. Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān's felicity 68
30. A brief life-sketch of the editor 68
31. A short Biography of Imām Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl Bukhārī 71
32. Genealogy and name 71
33. The parents of the Imām 71
34. Birth and education 72
35. Imām Bukhārī's travels in search of traditions ... 73
36. Teachers of Bukhārī in Makkah and Madinah ... 74
37. Journeys after the sojourns in Makkah and Madīnah ... 74
38. The rank of Imām Bukhārī in the Science of the tradition 75
39. The method of argumentation and evaluation adopted by Bukhārī 77
40. Bukhārī's role regarding *Asma' al-Ruwāt* and '*Ilal* ... 78
41. Imām Bukhārī's rank in Tradition science 79
42. Compilation of the *Aḥādīth:* A brief survey of its history 80
43. Transcription of *Ḥadīth* during Prophet's life-time ... 81
44. Compilation of the *Ḥadīth* and Ḥaḍrat 'Umar bin Khaṭṭāb 82
45. 'Umar Bin 'Abd al-'Azīz and compilation of the *Ḥadīth* 83
46. The first phase of the compilation of the *Ḥadīth* ... 83

S. No.	*Subject*	*Pages*
47.	The second phase in the compilation of the Tradition	84
48.	The third phase in the compilation of the Tradition	85
49.	Incentive to compile the *Ṣaḥīḥ*	85
50.	A brief survey of the Book	86
51.	Works by Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl Bukhārī	86
52.	The Juridical School followed by Bukhārī	90
53.	Imām Bukhārī and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah	90
54.	The Piety of Bukhārī	91
55.	A subtle point	91
56.	Similarity between Imām Bukhārī and Imām Mālik	92
57.	Acceptance of Prayer	93
58.	Bukhārī's Poetry	94
59.	Bukhārī's Life at Nishapur	95
60.	Tolerance	97
61.	Simplicity and contentment	97
62.	Humility	97
63.	Exercise	97
64.	Austere Living	97
65.	The number of *Aḥādīth* in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*	97
66.	Imām Bukhārī's death	98
67.	Prolegomena	100
68.	The Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* by Ḥakīm al-Islām Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyib, Rector, Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband	101
69.	Different ways of preserving religion	102
70.	Live group conforming to the tenets of Islam	103
71.	The benefit of Islam in all ages	104
72.	Two fundamental sources of Islam	104
73.	The Prophet: A means of bringing light unto darkness	106
74.	The Prophet's words as a means for understanding the Qur'ān	107
75.	The responsibility for the descent of the Qur'ān and its exegesis	109
76.	God has not authorised anyone to interpret the Qur'ān	110
77.	*Ḥadīth:* An exposition of the Qur'ān	111
78.	Determining the relationship between the Qur'ān and the *Sunnah*	113

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

79. *Ḥadīth* as standing authority of *Sharī'ah* 113
80. Relation of *Ḥadīth* to the Qur'ān and Muslim Jurisprudence 115
81. The scope allowed in questioning the authority of *Aḥādīth* 115
82. Provisions in the Qur'ān for sustaining and preserving the *Ḥadīth* 116
83. Four kinds of the *Ḥadīth* with respect to the number of narrators 117
84. Continuous narration: Kinds and grades 119
85. Continuous narration and its authoritativeness ... 120
86. The narrative mode of the Qur'ān 121
87. Two alternatives for the negators of *Ḥadīth* ... 121
88. Absoluteness of uninterrupted narrative established from the absoluteness of the Qur'ān 122
89. The Mashhūr, 'Azīz and Gharīb in the light of the Qur'ān 122
90. Dependence of every religion on one person only ... 124
91. There came a Prophet to every people 125
92. Report of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is adduction according to the principles of narration 127
93. Proof of entity of individual report from Non-Prophets 128
94. The report of evil-liver: Not rejected altogether ... 129
95. Different kinds of *Ḥadīth* according to the attributes of narrators 131
96. The Qur'ān as the basis of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Li-dhātihī* ... 132
97. Ten weaknesses explained by the Qur'ān 134
98. Negation of *Ṣaḥīḥ Li-dhātihī* is negation of the Qur'ān 138
99. The Qur'ān has acquainted us with *Ḥadīth* and narration 139
100. Discrediting Islam by discrediting the Qur'ān ... 140
101. The guardianship of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* by God unto the heart of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ... 140
102. Divine protection of the Qur'ān and its exposition for the *Ummah* 142
103. The guardianship of the Qur'ān and its exposition for all time 144
104. Scientific preservation of the *Ḥadīth* 148
105. The negators of *Ḥadīth:* A forewarning 149
106. Fabricators 149
107. The negators of the *Ḥadīth* 149

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

108. The distorters are unreliable 150
109. Divine strategy and the negators of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* 151
110. The correlation between the Qur'ān and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) 152
111. The Qur'ān and its translation 152
112. The peculiar manner of Imām Bukhārī in commencing this book 155
113. Replies to the objection 156
114. The best answer to the objection 157
115. Imām Bukhārī's headings 158
116. Introduction to the different works on Bukhārī's headings 158
117. Headings: An index to Bukhārī's sciences 159
118. Heading and its elucidation 159
119. Why commencement of the book with mention of revelation? 160
120. Concordance between the chapter on the commencement of revelation and the *Aḥādīth* reproduced thereunder ... 161
121. Shāh Walī Allāh's viewpoint 161
122. Mawlānā Muḥmud al-Ḥasan's view 162
123. Prophethood is bestowed, not acquired 164
124. The end of Prophethood 164
125. Rational for beginning with revelation 165
126. Difference in *Sharī'ahs* does not mean difference in revelation 166
127. The meaning of *Kayfa* 167
128. Similarity of headings 169
129. Imām Bukhārī's remarkable ingenuity in selecting the *Āyāt* 169
130. No one can describe the complete nature of *Waḥī* ... 170
131. The meaning of *Waḥī* 170
132. Ibn al-Qayyim on *Waḥī* 172
133. *Ilhām* (Inspiration) 173
134. The *Ṣiddīqs* and *Muḥaddaths* 173
135. Reason for fetching similitude between the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and preceding Prophets 174

S. No.	Subject	Pages
136.	Man a Microcosm	174
137.	Reasons for the similitude	175
138.	Authority for the above *Ḥadīth*	176
139.	Concord between the *Ḥadīth* and its heading ...	178
140.	The occasion for the above *Ḥadīth*	179
141.	A well known exposition	181
142.	Purport of the *Ḥadīth*: Two instances	181
143.	Good intent in bad act: Misgiving removed ...	182
144.	The *Ḥadīth:* In the light of the Qur'ān	183
145.	Persistence: Verbal and significatory	183
146.	Distinction between intention and volition	183
147.	Acting out of desire	184
148.	Imām Ghazāli's interpretation of *Mens*	184
149.	A special interpretation of the *Ḥadīth*	184
150.	Intention stressed	186
151.	Abū al-Hasan Sindhī's elucidation	187
152.	Why woman's mention after the World?	189
153.	Why Imām Bukhārī has excluded "For the sake of God and His Prophet"?	190
154.	Two problems	191
155.	Ibn Khaldūn's illustration	193
156.	Similitude of the *Waḥī*	194
157.	'Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī's viewpoint ...	194
158.	Ibn Ḥazm's view	194
159.	Relation of this *Ḥadīth* to the heading	195
160.	Linking the laudable with the abominable	196
161.	A caveat	197
162.	Bearing of *Waḥī* and divine light: An anecdote ...	199
163.	Sequestration in the cave of *Ḥirā*	205
164.	Nature of worship in *Ḥirā*	206
165.	Overwhelming zeal in search of truth	206
166.	The interpretation of *Mā Anā Bi-Qārī'īn*	207
167.	Perturbation does not mean diffidence	210
168.	The incident of Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Raẓī	212

S. No.	*Subject*	*Pages*
169.	Another illustration from Prophet Mūsa's life ...	212
170.	Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī's elucidation ...	212
171.	Period of surcease of *Waḥī* and the Prophet's gloominess	213
172.	Who first embraced Islam?	218
173.	Love for home	219
174.	In the cave of *Ḥirā* after the advent of *Waḥī* ..	222
175.	Misgiving removed	222
176.	Which *Āyah* descended first?	224
177.	Descent of *Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*	226
178.	The *Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah:* Epitome of the Qur'ān ...	226
179.	Concord between the *Ḥadīth* and its heading ...	228
180:	Final remarks	228
181.	A miracle	231
182.	Correlation of the *Āyāt*	231
183.	Correlation of different parts of *Al-Qiyāmah*: Qafal's explanation	232
184.	Ibn Kathīr's view	232
185.	Mawlānā Anwar Shāh's comment	232
186.	Relevance of this *Ḥadīth* to the heading	233
187.	Authority for the above *Ḥadīth*	233
188.	Distinction between charity and beneficence	233
189.	Some incidents showing the Prophet's genarosity ...	234
190.	Prophet's beneficence: Reflection of divine beneficence	234
191.	Exaltation of places and times	236
192.	Relevance of the *Ḥadīth* to the book of *Waḥī* ...	237
193.	Preliminary discussion of the *Ḥadīth* respecting Heraclius	241
194.	Second invitation to Heraclius to embrace Islam ...	243
195.	Brief history of Rūm	244
196.	Discussion of the *Ḥadīth*	244
197.	A problem	246
198.	The nature of *Shirk* and Shāh Walī Allāh	247
199.	Distinction between reverential and devotional prostration: Not a valid measure for all occasions ...	247
200.	Varieties of *Shirk*	248

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

201. Credos of the infidels in the light of the Qur'ān ... 248
202. Beliefs of the polytheist: Shāh Walī Allāh's view ... 249
203. Elaboration of the distinction between the creed of the Muslims and the polytheists 249
204. Associating partners with Allāh in respect of form ... 251
205. Distinction between the second type of *Shirk* and following the Imāms 251
206. The murder of Chosroe 255
207. Gentleness in correspondence 256
208. Islam and Muslim—exclusive or general—Al-Suyuti's View 257
209. The Writer's View: 258

CHAPTER II

210. (The Book of Faith) 260
211. Different Muslim Sects 261
212. The Sunnites 261
213. Different Sunnites Schools 261
214. Literal meaning of *Īmān* 262
215. Significance in *Shari'ah* 264
216. Ibn Sīnā's definition of testimony 265
217. The authority of *Sharḥ-e Wiqāyah* and 'Allāmah Taftāzānī 266
218. Deterministic knowledge and faith distinguished ... 266
219. Meaning of *Īmān* in *Shar'īah* 267
220. Heraclius definitely a non-believer 268
221. The interpretation of *Īmān* according to Rāzī and Ghāzālī 270
222. Interpretation by Ibn Humām, Ibn Taymīyah, and Abū Ṭālib Makkī 270
223. Heraclius and the Negus differentiated 272
224. Surrender: A condition or part of faith 272
225. Verbal affirmation 273
226. Scholastics *mutakallimeen* and verbal affirmation ... 273
227. Jurists and verbal affirmation 273

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

228. THE DEFINITIONS OF *IMAN* IN DIFFERENT SECTS 274
229. The Karrāmiyah 274
230. The Murjīah 274
231. The Mutazilites and the Kharijites 275
232. The Sunnite Creed 275
233. Refutation of a doubt concerning Imām Abū Ḥanīfah 277
234. Faith based on '*Taqlīd*' 279
235. Shaykh 'Abdul Qādir Jīlānī on the Ḥanafites ... 279
236. Sum and substance of the foregoing 279
237. Examination of the concept of *Īmān* by the Ḥanafites and the preferential arguments advanced by them ... 280
238. Dispelling a misgiving 281
239. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and the *Ḥadīth* concerning the Angel Jibra'īl 281
240. Arguments advanced by the *Muḥaddithīn* 281
241. Imām Ghazāli's dubiety on the *Muḥaddithīn's* approach 282
242. Imām Rāzī and *Muḥaddithīn* 282
243. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar's stand: A brief discussion 282
244. Nature of difference in the interpretations of faith ... 283
245. Standpoints of the *Muḥaddithīn* and Imām Abū Hanīfah: An illustration 285
246. Cause of divergence in interpretation : Mawlānā Muḥammad al-Ḥasan's view 286
247. Progress and deterioration of faith 286
248. Mawlānā Sayyid Anwar Shāh's viewpoint 286
249. Another statement of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah 287
250. Faith waxes; it wanes not 287
251. Sūbject of discussion: Famous statement of Imāms and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah 288
252. Imām Rāzī's investigation 288
253. Imām Nawawī's view 288
254. The view of Ibn Ḥazm 289
255. Author's view—'Uthmānī's viewpoint 289
256. Reasons for difference in the characteristics of faith 290

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

257. The second reason of the difference in the nature of faith 291
258. A question put to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah regarding increase and decrease in faith 291
259. The third reason for the difference in the nature of faith 292
260. Controversy due to faulty transcript 292
261. The nature of erroneous transcript 293
262. The statement of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah as reproduced by Ṭaḥāwī 293
263. The truthful and the false people 294
264. A detailed exposition of the stand of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah 296
265. Varieties of *Kufr* (infidelity) 299
266. *Īmān* (Faith) and the successive traditions 299
267. Succession or continuation of authorities 299
268. Hierarchical succession 299
269. Constancy of a common factor 300
270. *Īmān* a light and its grades are determined by Acts 301
271. The meaning of 'ليزدادوا ايماناً مع ايمانهم' 'That they may add faith to their faith' 303
272. The oath of Riḍwān 303
273. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and 'Allāmah Zamakhshrī 305
274. The *Āyah* explained 305
275. By excess of guidance is implied continuation and preservation of the guidance itself 306
276. Relationship between organs and natural capacity 308
277. Susceptibility is a condition to avail benefit of faith 311
278. Possibilities for the excess of faith 312
279. An admonition 312
280. Another admonition 314
281. Obligations, *Sharāi'*, *Ḥudūd*, and the tradition explained 316
282. A detailed explanation of ليطمئن قلبى 318
283. Distinction between advice and actual observation 319
284. Rebuttal of false doubts about "رب ارنى" and "اولم تؤمن" 320
285. Distinction between the negligence of the pious and the negligence of the impious 322

S. No.	*Subject*	*Pages*
286.	Complete belief saves one from sins	324
287.	The reality of piety	324
288.	Degrees of piety	324
289.	A glance at the arguments of Imām Bukhārī	327
290.	Imām Bukhārī's view according to the *Ḥadīth*	328
291.	The disorder of words in the *Ḥadīth*	329
292.	The secret of precedence of fasting in narration	329
293.	The order of the precedence of fasting and pilgrimage in the Qur'ān	330
294.	Importance of Chronology	332
295.	The first doctrine	333
296.	Rejoinder to Ibn Taymiyah on ذکر مفرد	334
297.	Comment on Imām Ghazāl'īs argument	334
298.	Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and Imām Ja'far al-Sādiq on Ism Al-A'zam	334
299.	Back to the topic again	335
300.	Arkān Arba'ah Explained	335
301.	The magnificence of God and *Maḥbūbīyat*	335
302.	*Ṣalāt* and *Zakāt*	336
303.	The reality of *ṣalāt* in the light of its components	336
304.	Explaining the words used in the call for prayer	336
305.	Etiquette prescribed for presenting oneself before God	337
306.	Reverence due to the direction of *Ka'bah* (*Qiblah*)	338
307.	The grandeur of the office of Imām of prayer	338
308.	*Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*: Titles of honour, courtesy, and substance of supplication	339
309.	A brief survey of the contents of the *Sūrah Al-Fātīḥah*	340
310.	Sanction by God on the sentences of the *Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*	340
311.	The Qur'ān as an answer to prayer	341
312.	Prayer for safety and asking blessing the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم)	342
313.	The significance of *Zakāt*	342
314.	The wonderful wisdom governing the scale of taxation	343
315.	The relationship between *Zakāt* and prayers	343

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

316. Fasting and *Ḥajj* 344
317. Fasting and *Ḥajj* as manifestation of the Love of God 345
318. *Iḥrām* 345
219. *Ṭawaf*, *Ḥajar Aswad*, and *Multazam* 346
320. Objection to the "محبوبيت" "loveliness" of God Answered 346

CHAPTER III

321. On matters relating to faith 348
322. Relation between chapter and the ***Āyah*** 349
323. Difference in the words employed in the narration ... 352
324. Allāmāh Ibn Ḥajar's lapse in this regard 352
325. Difference between preference and application ... 352
326. Researches by scholars on sections of faith ... 353
327. The best thesis on the different aspects of faith ... 353
328. The literary meaning of "حیا" 354
329. The meaning of "حیا" in the *Sharī'ah* 355
330. Modesty and the status of *Iḥsān* (benevolence) ... 355
331. Modesty observed by Ḥadrat 'Uthman 356
332. Islam modifies the practice of good attributes ... 357
333. Sum total of the discussion 358
334. The different kinds of foul aspects of modesty ... 358
335. Modesty intellectually defective 358
336. Comparison of the different kinds of modesty and the reasons for preference 359
337. Criticising lawful act of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) on the plea of convention should be avoided ... 359

CHAPTER IV

338. Due regard for the interpretation of the wisdom of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) 361

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER VI

339. Greetings (*Salām*) the best gift M 363
340. Greetings from God and salutations among the inhabitants of paradise 364

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*
341. *Salām* by the Angels 364
342. An investigation into the different answers concerning the above *Ḥadīth* 365
343. An excellent explanation for the difference in answers to the same question 367
344. Priority as a whole or in part 367
345. Difference in replies because of variation in the stages
346. of pre-eminence 368
347. Priority of some acts is based upon universal truth ... 368
348. Pre-eminence of some acts due to the dignified reward in after-life 369
349. Pre-eminence of some acts due to extreme humility M 370

CHAPTER VII

350. Dubiety No. 1 and its answer M 272
351. The meaning of *Ḥadīth*, "حتی يحب لاخيه" 372

CHAPTER VIII

352. The meaning and kinds of love 375
353. Natural love 375
354. Love due to favours 375
355. Love due to beauty 375
356. Love on account of merits 375
357. Love based on reason 376
358. What kind of love is intended in this *Ḥadīth*? ... 376
359. An example of love by wisdom and love by Faith ... 376
360. An Anṣārī Woman 377
361. 'Abdullāh bin Zayd bin 'Abdī Rabbihī 377
362. Ḥaḍrat 'Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah Sahmī 377
363. Love for Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is included in Love for Allāh 378
364. Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ and Qurtabī's interpretation 380
365. Objection and its reply regarding Ḥaḍrat 'Umar's *Ḥadīth* 380
366. Beauty of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar's statement 380
367. Results of love 381

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*
CHAPTER IX TASTE OF FAITH 381
368. Sweetness of belief and nearness to Allāh and Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) 382
369. Meaning of nearness to Allāh 382
370. Explanation of مما سواهما "Things other than the two, i. e., Allāh and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ... 383
371. Loveliness of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) 384
372. Refinement of expression 385
CHAPTER X 386
373. Disputes among companions about fighting agāinst infidels 386
CHAPTER XI 387
374. The meaning of *Bay'at* 389
375. A significant point in the *Āyāt* about slaying children 390
376. A significant point in the Qur'ān about Ramaḍān ... 390
377. Contradiction in *Aḥādīth* 392
378. Are *Ḥudūd Kaffārah* or not? 393
379. Ḥanafīs' first argument 393
380. Modern critics of Islamic Ḥudūd 394
381. Ḥanafīs' second argument 395
382. The statement of Shaykh al-Hind on Ḥudūd ... 396

CHAPTER XII

383. It is religious to run away from mischief 396
384. The theme of the chapter 396
385. Running away from corruption and *Rahbānīyat* ... 397
386. Secluded and social life 398

CHAPTER XIII

387. The saying of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) 398
388. *'Ilm* and *Ma'rifat* 398
389. The object of Imām Bukhārī 399
390. Stages of knowledge 400
391. The law of nature 403

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

392. An example of "I know more than you do" ... 403

CHAPTER XIV

393. The object of Imām Bukhārī 404

CHAPTER XV

394. Imām Bukhārī's purpose 405
395. Spiritual matters will be manifest in the Hereafter ... 405
396. Comprehensive knowledge is reserved for Allāh ... 406
397. Refutation of the Murji'ah and Mutazilites ... 406
398. Stream of *Ḥayāt or Ḥayā* 406
399. An objection and a reply 407
400. Superiority of Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq 407
401. Excellence of 'Umar 408

CHAPTER XVI

402. Imām Bukhārī's object 408
403. Modesty has been enjoined by all Prophets ... 409

CHAPTER XVII

404. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar's view regarding the above ... 410
405. Ḥāfiẓ Badruddīn 'Aynī's opinion 410
406. Imām Aḥmad and abandonment of prayers ... 411
407. An interesting dialogue between Imām Shafi'i and Imam Aḥmad 411

CHAPTER XVIII

408. Imām Bukhārī's first argument in support of the above 412
409. An objection to the word inheritance used above ... 412
410. Imām Bukhārī's second argument 413
411. Imām Bukhārī's third argument M 414
412. Imām Bukhārī's fourth argument 414

CHAPTER XIX

413. Imām Bukhārī's object and 'Allāmah 'Uthmānī's fourth discourse 415
414. Three formal ways of embracing Islam 416
415. Explanation of the *Ḥadīth* of the Chapter 416

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

CHAPTER XX

416. Publicity and flourishing of Islam 417
417. The first point in Ḥaḍrat 'Ammār's discourse ... 418
418. The second point 419
419. The third point 419
420. Ḥaḍrat 'Ammār and Ḥāfiẓ 'Aynī 419
421. Why did Imām Bukhārī repeat one *Ḥadīth* 419
422. The Imām's special merits of reasoning 420

CHAPTER XXI

423. "كفر دون كفر" (Disbelief below disbelief) 422
424. The elements of belief in a disbeliever 423
425. No disbeliever can be called a Muslim for having certain qualities of a Muslim 424
426. Stages of *Īmān* and *kufr* 424
427. *Ẓulmun dūna Ẓulmin* 425
428. *Shīrk dūna Shirk* 425
429. *Nifāq dūna Nifāq* 426
430. *Kufr*, *Ẓulm* and *Nifāq* 426
431. The meaning of *Dūna* 426
432. Difference between *kufr* and *kufrān* 427
433. The final discourse on the word *dūna* 427

CHAPTER XXII

434. Objects of *Ḥadīth* 430
435. Use of an adjective for a verb 430
436. To call a person *kāfir* 431
437. Priest Funder's Fraud 433
438. Difference between what bewilders intellect and what is impossible 433
439. An evidence regarding 'Uzayr (Ezra) 434
440. Truthfulness of the Qur'ān and disbelievers' nonsensical views 434
441. Difference between intentions and anxiety 436

CHAPTER XXIII

442. Kinds of *Ẓulm* 439

443. Why did not the Companions interpret *Ẓulm* as *Shirk* ? 440
444. Evidence for interpreting *Ẓulm* as *Shirk* 440
445. Contest with the Mu'tazilites 441

CHAPTER XXIV

446. Imām Ghazālī's discourse on breach of promise ... 445
447. Difference between hypocrisy in work and hypocrisy belief 446
448. *Īman, fisq* and *nifāq* according to Shāh Walīullāh ... 447
449. The Qur'ān and characteristics of a hypocrite ... 448
450. Philosophy behind three signs of hypocrisy ... 449
451, Reason for not calling a Muslim hypocrite ... 450
452. Ḥasan Baṣrī's change of view 450

CHAPVER XXV

CHAPTER XXVI

453. A martyr goes to Paradise immediately 457
454. Ḥabīb Najjār's martyrdom 457

CHAPTER XXVII

455. Relevancy with objective 458
456. Remission possible only when nothing repugnant to it 459
457. Attributes of acts 459

CHAPTER XXVIII

458. A dubiety to the arrangement of chapters 460
459. Dubiety W 461
460. Explanation 461

CHAPTER XXIX

461. *Ḥanafiyyat*, Judiasm, and Christianity 465
462. Relevancy and the purpose of translation 465
463. Rewards far in excess in comparison with prayers ... 466
464. Direction for mediation and moderation 468
465. Obligatory and optional observance 469
466. Happy tidings or basharat 470
467. Times of gladness 471
468. Periodical aid 471

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

469. The meaning of *isti'anat* (help) 472

CHAPTER XXX

Prayers are a part of the Faith 472

470. The connection 473
471. The meaning of the Qur'ānic verse in the present chapter 473
472. The natural predilection of the Holy Prophet towards the Ka'bah 475
473. Owners of the Elephants 476
474. Why was Jerusalem the first Qiblah of Islam? ... 477
475. commandment or personal judgment 478

CHAPTER XXXI

476. What is the meaning of beauty of Islam: 483
477. Why did Bukhārī omit the second part of the *Ḥadīth* ... 487
478. Opinions regarding the good work of disbelievers ... 487
479. Good deeds devoid of spirit 489
480. Good deeds of a disbeliever and benefits in the hereafter 490
481. Alleviation of punishment 490
482. Alleviation of punishment in the beginning and in the end 491

CHAPTER XXXII

483. The best obedience to Allāh the Most Exalted is one which is perpetual 491
484. Object of the *Ḥadīth* 491
485. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar's view 492
486. Praise on one's face 492

CHAPTER XXXIII

487. Connection 494
488. Doubt of repetition and its removal 494
489. Comment on Imām Bukhārī's argument 495

CHAPTER XXXIV

490. *Zakāt* (poor-due) is a part of Islam 497
491. The meaning and relevancy (of the quotations) ... 498
492. The problem of *Witr* (Prayer) 500

S. No. Subject Pages
493. On repeating *nafl* prayer when not timely performed ... 501
494. Shawafi' on repetition of *Nafl* not being necessary ... 502
495. Ḥanafites on tne necessity of performing non-obligatory Prayers again 502
496. Preference of the arguments of the Ḥanafites ... 503
497. Some difficulties 504
498. Negligence in performing acts according to tradition ... 504
499. An interpretation by Shaykh al-Hind 506
500. On differences and conflicts in narrations 506
501. No exemption from obligatory prayers 507

CHAPTER XXXV

502. The object of chapter 509

CHAPTER XXXIV

503. The objective 511
504. A reply to Zamakhsharī's argument on destruction of deeds 512
505. Reply to the interpretation of Ibn al-Qayyim on the destruction of deeds 513
506. Meaning of *Ḥabṭ* 514
507. The view of Ibrāhīm Taymī 515
508. The view of Ibn Abī Mulaykah 515
509. Ḥasan Baṣrī's view 517
510. Reply to the Murjites' view 520
511. The second dubious view of the Murjites 521
512. On the Day of Judgemnt qualities will assume the form of object itself 521
513. Qurā'nic interpretation by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) 523
514. Quarrelling with each other is the cause of deprivation 524
515. The verdict of religious scholars on repetition of sins ... 526

CHAPTER XXXVII

516. The real implications of *Īmān*, *Islam* and *Iḥsān* ... 533
517. Religious laws, mystic path, spiritual knowledge ... 534
518. The stage of being chosen and of turning (towards God) 534
519. Interpretation of *Iḥsan* by Ibn Ḥajar 535

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

520. The place of ***Mushāhdah*** (personal observation) and *Muraqabah* (meditation) 535
521. Comments of Nawawi and Mawlānā Sindhi on *Iḥsān* 537
522. Summary 537
523. The mention of *Īmān* (faith), *Islam* and *Iḥsān* in the Qur'ān 538
524. Arrangement of Jibra'il's questions and the connection with each other 539
525. A doubt 540
Answer 540
526. Universal knowledge is the attribute of God alone ... 542
527. The title of *'Ālim al-Ghayb* (knower of the unseen) ... 544
528. An anecdote about Imām Malik... 544
529. Keys of the invisible 545
530. Why were five unseen things particularised? ... 545
531. The meaning of *Ghayb* (unseen) 546

CHAPTER XXXVIII

532. Reason for the chapter without subject-matter ... 546
533. Shaykh al-Hind's view 547
534. Partition of *Ḥadīth* 547

CHAPTER XXXIX

535. The object and connection with the subject-matter ... 548
536. Detailed discussion on *Mushtabahāt* 549
537. Difference between *Mushtabahāt* and *Wasāwis* ... 550
538. Reason is located in heart or brain 551

CHAPTER XL

539. Distinguishing position of the teacher 553
540. Four or five things 556
541. 'Allāmah Sindhī's explanation of the controversial points 557
542. Why is *Ḥajj* not included in the *Ḥadīth* ? 557
543. Relevancy and object of the *Ḥadīth* 558

CHAPTER XLI

544. Relevancy and object of *Ḥadīth* 559

CHAPTER XLII

545. The meaning of Nasihat 562

CHAPTER XLIII

546. Relevancy of The Book of Knowledge aud The Book of Faith 564
547. What is 'Ilm (Knowledge) 564

S. No. *Subject* *Pages*

548. To understand *'Ilm* depends on our understanding of *'Aql* 564
549. *'Aql* (Reason) and Shari'at (Islam) 565
550. Excellence of Knowledge 565
551. Grades of knowledge 566
552. 'Aynī's and Sindhī's opinions regarding "قول" ... 567

CHAPTER XLIV

553. Explanations of the above 568
554. Relevancy and Object 568

CHAPTER XLV

555. The substance of *Ḥadīth* 569
556. Relevancy and object of the *Ḥadīth* 562

CHAPTER XLVI

557. Different ways of narrating *Aḥādīth* 571
558. Different ways of acquiring *Ḥadīth* 571
559. Relevance of *Ḥadīth* and its subject-matter 572
560. Comparison of a Muslim with palm tree 573

CHAPTER XLVII

561. Relevancy and object 574
562. The substance of *Ḥadīth* 575

CHAPTER XLVIII

563. There is no mention of *Ḥajj* in this *Ḥadīth* 579
564. Ibn al-Tin, Waqidi and Ibn Ḥajar 579
565. Connection between *Ḥadīth* and subject-matter ... 580

CHAPTER XLIX

566. Connection 581
567. Relevancy of *Ḥadīth* and subject-matter 583
568. Relevancy of *Ḥadīth* and subject-matter 584
569. The End 584

The composing, transliteration, Block-setting and layout of *Faḍl al-Bārī Sharhe Bukhārī* Vol. I in English have been carried out by Idarah Ulume Shariah. The printing has been done by Javed and Anjuman Presses, Karachi.

FOREWORD

by

Dr. Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi

Most of us who have been educated in accordance with the academic methods of the West are ignorant of the depth of the tradition of Islamic learning still kept alive in some of our *Madrasahs* and *Dār al-'Ulūms*. Indeed the dialogue between scholars in the two traditions has ceased to the extent that they have become total strangers to one another. The world of Islam is for that reason, the poorer. If some of us get an inkling of the depth of scholarship available in our old style academic institutions we are stricken with a sense of loss that defies quantification.

It was my good fortune to come into contact with the late 'Allāmā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī during the early years of Pakistan and the last years of his life. I cannot claim even a superficial knowledge of the sciences in which he excelled, but I could discern a sharp intellect, a depth of learning and a mastery of religious and scholastic disciplines that he professed. Indeed he was, as would be readily conceded by many deeply learned scholars of these subjects, a true and illustrious representative of the tradition to which he belonged.

He has left behind him a valuable contribution to the exegesis of the Qur'ān and his commentary on the well known collection of *Ḥadīth* known as *Ṣaḥiḥ Muslim* has gained not only acceptance but recognition in all learned circles which deal with the traditions of the Prophet, on whom be peace and blessings of the Almighty.

Scholars in the West are fully aware that some valuable books have originated in courses of lectures delivered to students by learned professors; but there would be very few instances of a book of such dimensions as *Faḍl al-Bārī* having grown from class room lectures. This in itself is a commentary upon the excellence of the quality of some of the teachings in the leading seminaries of Islam. Mawlānā Muḥammad Anwar Shāh, a well known scholar of *Ḥadīth* lectured on Bukhārī in the Jāmi' al-Islāmiah Dabhel. Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī at that time lectured on Muslim and *Baayḍāwī*. On the retirement and subsequent death of Mawlānā Muḥammad Anwar Shāh, Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī started lecturing on *Tirmidhī* and *Bukhārī*. This book has come out of the Mawlānā's lectures on *Bukhārī*.

His commentary upon Muslim, *Fatḥ-al-Mulhim* though still incomplete is a regular book, written as such in three volumes, but his lectures on *Bukhārī* were delivered to students, one of whom took copious notes and showed them to the Mawlānā. But they remained notes, taken during lectures. Naturally they were not organized into a book, the documentation and cross references ware sketchy and needed amplification and even verification. The Mawlānā had a prodigious memory, because he spoke without notes; yet his comments were so rich and learned that it would have been a terrible loss if they had been lost to prosterity.

The production of a book from such materials was not easy, therefore those who looked at the notes were overwhelmed with the awe-inspiring magnitude of the work needed to organize it properly into the form of a book. Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān undertook the onerous task and has produced the first volume, of *Faḍl al-Bārī*, another has been completed and he is now working on the third. The book is to cover twelve volumes, which shows what a lārge undertaking it is for one scholar. The publication of the book, when completed, in Urdu will be a great achievement in itself, but almost a simultaneous publication of an English translation is a very great venture indeed.

Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd-al-Raḥmān has done an excellent job in the Urdu version, which reads as fluently as a detailed version would have been by Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī himself. He has left no missing links either in the documentation or the cross references—a stupendous task in itself—and has entered so thoroughly into the spirit of the material that the reorganisation bears the hall mark of learning and full understanding.

Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ is an extensive collection and consists of traditions (*Aḥādīth*) on practically every aspect of Muslim belief and religious life. Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī's commentary has assumed encyclopaedic comprehensiveness and proportions. The scholar, the research worker and the layman alike will find it a store house of information on Islam. This book is most certainly a land mark in the history of the literature on Islam and will have to be consulted by every student—Muslim or non-Muslim—in future.

Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi

FADL AL-BARI IN ENGLISH

Hakim al-Islam Mawlana Muhammad Tayyib

Rector, Dar al-'Ulum, Deoband

GLAD TIDINGS FOR EUROPE AND AFRICA
MAY GOD RAISE SUPPORTERS IN ALL DIRECTIONS

Congratulatory messages have been pouring in from all parts of the Muslim world on the editing and publication of the Urdu Commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* entitled, *Faḍl al-Bārī* on the lectures by Shaykh al-Islam Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī. Prominent scholars of *Ḥadīth* and theology experts in Islamics and thinkers and others interested in the promotion of spiritual knowledge all have acclaimed it as an important contribution to the real understanding of the traditions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

To carry the message of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to the Engliah knowing world as well, it was decided simultaneously to publish the English translation of *Faḍl al-Bārī*, and by the grace of Almighty Allāh we are now in a position to present to scholars all over the world, both Muslim and non-Muslim, the English translation of the first volume of *Fāḍl al-Bārī*. It proved to be a herculean task, but it is hoped, carried out equitably despite innumerable hurdles.

The Idārah-e-'Ulūm-i-Shar'īyyah has maintained regular contact with its academic centre, Dār al-'Ulūm (Deoband), as also with its Rector, Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṭayyib, the patron of Idārah. He too has conveyed to the Idārah his esteemed views on the publication of English translation of ***Fāḍl al-Bārī***, as under:-

"Praise be to Allah, and peace be on His Prophet.

It is difficult to find proper words to recompense the great service done by Mawlānā Qaḍi 'Abd al-Raḥman to scholarly circles by editing and publishing ***Faḍl al-Bārī***. It is an Urdu Commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, as annotated by the great scholar of Islam Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī.

The treatise is of permanent value, its scope is all embracing, and its reward beyond description. This Commentary encompasses not only theological knowledge but is also the repository of general knowledge of mundane affairs. And to crown this laudable effort a beginning has been made to render this Commentary into the English language. Some of its preliminary portions have been sent to me for my perusal. I am confident that not only Muslims will benefit spiritually from this work of everlasting value, but the people in the European countries in general and the Westernized people in particular, who are now in the grip of materialism, also will find spiritual solace and guidance. They too will now become familiar with Islamic knowledge and wisdom.

The Dean of the Faculty of *Ḥadīth* at Dār al-'Ulūm at Deoband (India) and founder of the Institution Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim sometime, before his demise, had expressed the wish that he might learn the English language and go to Europe to tell the Western scholar that wisdom was not that which they held to be wisdom, but it lay in the instruction imparted to mankind by the Final Prophet of God Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to enlighten the hearts and brains of the people on the basis of divine inspiration. But unfortunately Mawlānā Qāsim died before his wish could materialise.

It is very much gratifying that Mawlānā Qaḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān has undertaken to give a practical shape to the wish of Mawlānā Qāsim. The main reason for undertaking this stupendous task is the fact that the compiler of Faḍl al-Bārī 'Allama 'Uthmānī had full command of the teachings of Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim and used to refer to them in his lectures on the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth*. The impress of Mawlānā Qāsim's teachings is found in Mawlānā 'Uthmānī's Commentary on the Qur'ān entitled *Fawā'idi Qur'ān* and his exegesis of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, entitled *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*.

The same trend of thinking is fully reflected in *Faḍl al-Bārī*. So when its English translation would become available to the people of Europe and Afrīca, it would mean that the last wish of Mawlānā Qāsim would have been fulfilled. It would prove to be a great boon to the peoples of the two continents. Let us hope that people will come forward every where to spread this Islamic knowledge and spiritual guidance to every nook and corner of the world.

Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥman deserves our gratitude and congratulations for giving a practical shape to the wish of Mawlānā Qāsim by publishing *Fāḍl al-Bārī*, in English. He has proved to be a true scion of his *alma mater*, the Dārul 'Ulūm at Deoband.

Undoubtedly, as the spiritual light enkindled by Mawlānā Qāsim would spread far and wide, his soul also would feel more and more peace in the Hereafter.

Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān too has secured for himself both in this and the next world a place of pride. While he has improved his own mundane and spiritual prospects, he has also undertaken to diffuse the spiritual light enkindled by Mawlānā Qāsim all over the globe.

The task is stupendous, its amplifications defy description, and spiritual advantages limitless, How one can pay tribute to such a gigantic effort except say:

"The periscope of my sight is limited while the beauty of thy flower is so variegated."

The only recompense we may make is to offer our heart-felt and sincere prayers that God may recompense him with a good reward both in this world and the Hereafter.

It is hoped that the English Version of *Faḍl al-Bārī* will be found even more useful than its Urdu counterpart because of its approach to a much larger number of people.

May God enable the author to complete the work as early as possible.

It is also my sincere prayer that dedicated people will come forward to help complete this noble task. May God help them all.

Muḥammad Ṭayyib

14 Rajab, 1395 A.H.

Transliteration

Please read the ʻArabic words according to the symbols of transliteration given hereunder :—

b	ب
t	ت
th	ث
j	ج
ḥ	ح
d	د
dh	ذ
r	ر
z	ز
s	س
sh	ش
ṣ	ص
ḍ	ض
ṭ	ط
ẓ	ظ
ʻ	ع
gh	غ
f	ف
q	ق
k	ک
l	ل
m	م
n	ن
w	و
h	ه
y	ی

ā	*a*
ḥ	*h*
ī	*i*
ṣ	*s*
ḍ	*d*
ẓ	*z*
ṭ	*t*
q	*k*

'ALLAMAH SHABBIR AHMAD UTHMANI

COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY QUR'AN IN ENGLISH
A CLASSIC TREATISE ON THE SUBJECT

Among the memorable academic achievements of 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī, his Commentary on the Holy Book entitled, "Tafsīr-e-Uthmānī" has won universal approbation.

Commentaries on the Holy Qur'ān abound in number, but 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad's Commentary is unique in its appealing style, vivid elucidation of the issues involved and its close relationship with the Qur'ānic text. It has therefore rightly been acclaimed as one of the best Commentaries on the Holy Qur'ān. One of its distinguishing features is that it is in alignment with modern thinking and requirements.

It is therefore not surprising that Muslims living in countries having a non-Muslim majority are keen to have an English translation of this Classic Commentary.

In order to meet this urgent religious need of the Muslims of these countries, we have undertaken to publish in two Volumes an English version of the Commentary. A former Pakistani Judge, who is also an English scholar with a style of his own, is now engaged in executing this task.

We confidently hope this endeavour of the Idārah will be welcomed throughout the English-knowing Muslim world.

Idārah

Praise be to Allāh that he enabled me to go through a final proof of the last pages of the First Volume of Faḍl al-Bārī in English during the late hours of night, this twenty-seventh day of September 1975 (C. E.) corresponding to 20th of Ramaḍān 1395 A.H.

How can this humble servant thank Thee, My Lord, for Thy abiding grace that guided him all through the first stage of his journey now successfully completed

May Thy guidence continue to grace the humble servant till the end of his long journey and may this humble effort find acceptance in Thy sublime presence. May Thou popularise this treatise among all peoples and in all clines.

Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān

This is the first attempt of its kind so far as the Science of *Ḥadīth* is concerned. However, it will be presumptuous on our part to claim that we have been able to achieve what we have set out to accomplish.

This volume covers the complete translation of Faḍl al-Bārī Vol. I in Urdu. However some very difficult portions have not been translated which are meant only for research scholars. Such portions may be seen in the Urdu Version.

The task indeed is very much demanding, requiring utmost care and devotion. Hurdles are many, sometime even disheartening. So whatever has been accomplished is beyond our expectations. We are convinced that our readers will share this view. We also hope that useful and thought-provoking suggestions will be forthcoming from our learned readers for a better get-up of the second volume of this Commentary. All such suggestions for improvement will be duly considered and gratefully acknowledged.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful

Incentive for Translating The Fadl al-Bari into English

The precise title of what is known as the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* (Collection of Authentic Aḥadīth by Imām Bukhārī) is *Al-Jāmi' al-Musnad min Ḥadīth-i-Rasūl Allāh wa Sunanihī wa Ayyāmihī*. No better and more comprehensive title could have been possible for such a work on the Tradition. The recognition and importance accorded to it can be judged from the simple fact that no other work on the Tradition could attract such a vast number of eminent exegetes. Commentaries on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* have appeared in English and French and so have its translations. 'Allāmah Ḥāfiz ibn Ḥajar 'Asqalānī, 'Allāmah Ḥāfiz Badr al-Dīn bin Aḥmad 'Aynī, Imām Fakhr al-Dīn Yaḥyā Nawawī, Imām Abū Sulaymān Khiṭābī (رحمهم الله) the author of the *Mu'ālim al-Sunan* and Ḥafiz Jalāl al-Dīn Suyūtī (رحمة الله عليه) are among the foremost commentators of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Mawlānā 'Abd al-Salām Mubārakpūrī (رحمة الله عليه) has mentioned the titles of as many as 143 commentaries in his *Sīrat al-Bukhārī* (the Life of Bukhārī). But even this number is incomplete. None of the anthologies of the Aḥadīth except the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* has received compliment of the *Aṣaḥḥ al-Kutub B'ada Kitāb al-lāh*—The Most Authentic Book after the Holy Qur'ān—and it is placed next to the Holy Qur'ān because of its unique excellence.

The *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* are particularly held to be more authentic than the other anthologies of the Aḥadīth. But while both are authentic, the question naturally arises which of the two has precedence over the other. The general consensus is that the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is the more authentic. But some Orientalists incline in favour of the latter. Such a view, however, is not tenable because the *Bukhārī* has precedence over the *Muslim* on some very cogent grounds. In scientific and logical arrangement of the *Aḥādīth* suitability of captions, veracity of the narrators, deductive power, total absence of obscurities, continuity of the chain of narrators, causation and excellence of diction, both can be evenly compared. But it must not be overlooked that the *Bukhārī* is the first in the field, clearing the way for the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Therefore, even if the *Muslim* shows improvement in arrangement and other matters, it does not diminish the comparative merit of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Such flaws of minor nature do not decrease the worth of a book, particularly when the writer had no model before him to follow.

It would seem that Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) a reputed religious scholar, had been ordained by his Creator for the task of writing a comprehensive commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in our times. It is well that this invaluable work relating to the Tradition is appearing at a time when misconceptions about Islām are being fanned by its antagonists. The distinguishing merit of the scholarly contributions of Shaykh al-Islām Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmani (رحمة الله عليه) is that the misunderstandings created by the opponents of Islām have been eradicated through very sound arguments, and the distortions made by the heretics have been quashed by means of authoritative texts and logical reasoning. Every line of these invaluable elucidations reflects the exceptional greatnesss of the writer.

Imām Bukhārī has classified different *Aḥādīth* into appropriate chapters according to the subject-matter deducing conclusions useful for human society. Mawlānā Shabbir Aḥmad Uthmānī has followed the same course and studied the sayings of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in the light of present-day knowledge and circumstances.

Imām Bukhārī has displayed remarkable scholarship and comprehension in his exposition of the different chapters, and various exegetes of the succeeding generations have concentrated their energies and thoughts on interpreting them. But it is not within the reach of everyone to benefit from these discourses. This work by Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) on the *Ṣaḥiḥ Bukhārī* is meant for the present generation. So the Mawlānā has assumed the stance of a teacher who has to carry across the significances of the Tradition to those who have no access to the Arabic originals or to the more advanced works on them. Thus, those who can not attend lectures on the Tradition or have no knowledge of Arabic can readily benefit from this work which has been given the title of the *Faḍl al-Bārī* (the Grace of God). In this book, side by side with the interpretation and exposition of the chapters and their significances, their relevance to the Tradition, the lectures and discussions with regard to the text, citation of the legal rulings deducible from the Tradition supported by sound arguments and logical proofs, and the reasons for preference of the approved rulings, we find niceties, witticisms, anecdotes and episodes. In short, there is, in this anthology, everything delightful and easily intelligible, in popular language, required for both teachers and students of the *Bukhārī*.

It is evident from the writings of Mawlānā Muḥammad Yaḥyā Siddīqī (مد ظله العالى) and other scholars that this treasure of knowledge consists of a collection of lectures on the *Bukhārī* by the late Shaykh al-Islām (رحمة الله عليه) for which he had enjoined thorough revision with reference to all the relevant books and authorities. It was not very much of a problem to get these lectures published. The real difficulty was to get the whole matter thoroughly revised with reference to the indicated allusions. This really was a matter of grave responsibility. I have left the language and exposition of these drafts as they were. But I have rearranged and adjusted the subject-matter of the exegesis. So the reader will find in it a concordance of the lectures and the recordings thereof. Now that the lectures of the Shaykh al-Islām (رحمة الله عليه) have been put into writing and the relevant books have been consulted in accordance with his instructions. It is still possible that some flaws in diction and exposition may be noticed by readers. I am fully conscious of it. But in view of the unusual circumstances under which the work was undertaken I hope the readers will overlook them.

Men of letters, perhaps, may not be able to assess correctly the difficulties faced by me in this venture. It is comparatively easy to write on any topic according to one's own plan. But it is far more difficult to collate, rearrange, and revise the scholarly and erudite writings of a savant of the calibre of the late Shaykh al-Islām (رحمة الله عليه) whose knowledge and erudition have been acknowledged by scholars of eminence of this half century. I entertain the hope from servitors of and heirs to the heritage of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that they would apprise me of their valuable comments and suggestions. This task is a long-term one. When I took it up I had no idea of its arduous nature. I am, therefore, in great need of the prayers of sincere friends and well-wishers who, all aflame with the love of the Prophet, are aflutter like a moth in its yearning for the flame; and I look forward to my fellow brothers in Islām that in disseminating the message of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) they would join hands with me and keep me posted with their valuable suggestions.

The late 'Allāmah Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) had processed these valuable discourses before Pakistan came into existence. He hoped to get them published on migration to the new-born state of Pakistan. But his wish could not be fulfilled in his life-time. The votaries of the Prophet's heritage were anxiously awaiting that this treasury of knowledge should come to light. Thank God, to-day the dream of Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī, (رحمة الله عليه) is at last being translated into reality.

The proposal for translating the *Faḍl al-Bārī* into English was made at Madīnah when I had the privilege of visiting the Holy City after years of toil in the field of the *Ḥadīth* and presenting the fruits of my efforts at the shrine of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). My Shaykh (Spiritual Guide) Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyā (مد ظله العالى) also happened to be there and I had the felicity of his company which I treasure as a great honour and a great asset of my life as it proved a great stimulus to me in undertaking this task.

I was also advised by many friends to get the work translated into English as the mission of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is for all mankind and Muslims are spread all over the world. The English translation of the work would be useful for Muslims and non-Muslims alike, particularly for the former in view of the fact that the present-day thinking is being influenced by secular thought, and for the latter, in general, in order to remove the misunderstandings about Islām prevailing among them. The following *āyah* was recited at a sitting in Medina:

And We have not sent thee (O Muḥammad) save as a bringer of good tidings and a warner unto all mankind, but most of mankind know not. (Qur'ān 34:28)	وَمَآ أَرْسَلْنٰكَ إِلَّا كَآفَّةً لِّلنَّاسِ بَشِيرًا وَّنَذِيرًا وَّلٰكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ (سبا آيت ٢٨)

This *āyah* moved all of us deeply and inspired us to get this work translated into English as early as possible, for the mission of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is not confined to Arabia only but is for the whole of humanity in order that good and evil may be made distinct.

How Man Can Attain Immortality

I firmly believe that the inspiration to render *Faḍl al-Bārī* into English was received as a boon from the sanctum of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and a succour from God to serve the cause of Islām. Those who were instrumental in giving this idea a concrete shape deserve their names to be inscribed in letters of gold. There is no doubt that their devotion to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and to the eternal message he has brought for mankind has made them immortal.

Man is mortal but the desire to attain immortality is there in him. Devotion to truth makes him immortal. Although those who were associated with the idea are now far off and thousands of miles intervene between us and them, nevertheless, the unity of purpose has removed all geographical distances and it seems as if we were members of the same fraternity living in different places and co-operating in the completion of this task. The names of the illustrious persons who gave birth to this idea are :

AL-HAJ GOOLAM HOOSEN MOHAMMED RANDEREE
AL-HAJ ABDULHUQ MOHAMMED JASSAT
AL-HAJ EBRAHIM AHMED BHABHA, BELFAST
AL-HAJ HAFEZ AHMED ISMAIL BULBULIA

I have mentioned these names so that readers of the English version of the *Faḍl al-Bārī*, wherever they might be, should cherish their memory and pray for them.

Role of the Ummah in Guarding Islam

Nothing can match the achievement of Muslims in preserving the sayings, life-events, and deeds of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). What could be more astonishing than this that the names and biographical sketches of no less than thirteen thousand persons who had the privilege of the company of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) were recorded in an age when the art of writing and compilation was in its inception. The *Ṭabaqāt ibn S‘ad, Kitāb al-Ṣaḥābah ibn Sakan, Kitāb Le ‘Abd Allāh Bin ‘Alī ibn Jārūd, Kitāb al-‘Aqīlī fi al-Ṣaḥḥābah, Kitāb ibn ‘Alī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Kitāb al-Azrak, Kitāb al-Dulābī, Kitāb al-Baghawī, Ṭabaqāt ibn Mākula, Uṣd al-Ghābah, Al-Isti‘āb* and *al-Iṣābah* are exclusively concerned with an account of the life-events of these illustrious persons. Was it possible that the names and biographical notices of so many companions of any other individual could ever be recorded ?

Whoever is born in this world is bound to depart, and we are thankful to God Almighty that He has set us to this work of enduring value.

Our Present Responsibility

With the undertaking of the English translation, our responsibilities have doubled, as we are carrying on work in both the languages English and Urdū, simultaneously. The work with regard to the *Faḍl al-Bārī*, the Urdū annotation of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, alone requires references to hundreds of standard Arabic books and the preparation of the final draft is, therefore, a very long and arduous process. Only after surmounting the initial hurdles, can the work of printing commence.

The English translation might appear to be an easy job but in fact it is not. In the first place, the translated passages have to be compared with the original and the typescripts are sent to the members of the Board who examine the translation. The staff of the *Idārah-i-Ulūm-i-Shar‘iyyah* then consults the translator who gives the scripts the final touch. Great pains have to be taken by the staff to ensure correct transliteration without which the English renderings of Arabic words and names cannot be pronounced correctly.

Recourse has been taken to slight omissions in the English version of the book, particularly with respect to technical and minute matter. This decision was reached at Madīnah with the approval of my preceptor Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyā (مد ظله العالی) and is being given effect to. The Engish version of the *Faḍl al-Bārī* would be appearing simultaneously with the Urdū edition. The whole work is expected to run into 12 volumes and we have been, by the Grace of God, able to acquire the services of eminent scholars who can handle this task efficiently in a dedicated spirit.

I pray to God to condone my lapses in the performance of this task and bless this offering with His Grace, and by disseminating its benefits to all mankind, make it a means of enhancing the ranks of Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) and my father, Mawlānā Nūr Ḥusayn (رحمة الله عليه) as also a means of my salvation.

I feel happy that I have been able to acquit myself in performing a part of the great task that has been assigned to me by the Grace of God Almighty.

Qāḍi 'Abd al-Raḥmān,
a servant dedicated to Islamic learning.

Shawwāl, 29, 1394 A. H.
November, 15, 1974

Background of the Fadl al-Bari

By

Mawlana Muhammad Yahya Siddiqi,
Son-in-law of the late Shaykh al-Islam Allamah Shabbir Ahmad Uthmani

Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) was endowed with a special gift of communicative power and the capacity to illustrate his point. His contemporaries, therefore, often turned to him for resolving important religious problems of the day. The 'Allāmah could explain higly complicated problems lucidly and was equal to any task. He had the same pith and substance in his conversations as he had in his formal writings. The points gathered from his talks and speeches yielded a rich treasure of knowledge. The Mawlānā's outstanding works are the *Tafsīr-i-Qur'ān* (Exegesis of the Qur'ān) and the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* (Manifestation of the Inspirer), a commentary of the *Muslim Sharīf*. Mawlānā Sayyid Anwar Shāh (رحمة الله عليه) desired that the 'Allāmah should undertake a commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* also on the same lines as he followed in his Urdū exegesis of the Holy Qur'ān. In fact, it was Mawlānā Sayyid Anwar Shāh (رحمة الله عليه) who was the prime mover for him to undertake a commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in Urdū. Mawlānā Anwar Shāh's wish was virtually realised when, after his death, the seat of teaching the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* was shifted to Dabhel under 'Allāmah Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه). After having rendered singular service in teaching the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* for a long time, and compilation of the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*, he turned his attention to delivering lectures on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, although it was by no means an easy task to discharge the onerous duties of his distinguished predecessor. This was the golden period of 'Allāmah's life because it pertained to the elucidation of the *Ṣaḥīh Bukhārī* by him. In the very first year of his lectures, he associated one of his learned pupils for taking them down. The process of revision, additions and alterations went on for years. And he left instructions to turn to standard reference books as indicated so far so that he specifically noted down even the chapters of the books in some cases. It is thus evident that the 'Allāmah was very keen to see that his work also should be a standard one, specially, with regard to the *Bukhārī* and its bibliographical references. On migration to Pakistan, the 'Allāmah, despite his many preoccupations, was highly desirous of getting the book published. But he died in the meantime. A brochure named the *Mas'alah-i-Taqdīr* (The Problem of Predestination), from among his lectures on the *Bukhārī*, was printed and published by his younger brother, the late Faḍl-i-Haq Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه). The title was given by Muftī Muhammad Shafi' (مد ظله العالى) who collated its subject-matter as well.

The question arises why the publication of such an invaluable work was held up for so long. I think it necessary, therefore, to shed light upon the reasons for the delay.

In the margin of the manuscripts, the 'Allāmah put down certain instructions with respect to points arising therefrom. If there was to be any deficiency left in some discourse it could be removed by referring to the elucidation of any standard commentator with regard to any particular Tradition, opinions of the exegetes, the works of acknowledged authorities on the Tradition like Shaykh Muḥy al-Dīn ibn al-'Arabī, Imām Ghazālī, Ibn Taymīyah, Ibn Qayyim, Shāh Walī allah (رحمة الله عليه), and so on. Then the 'Allāmah indicated the names of various books to be consulted. Research on these references and translating their original Arabic text into Urdū was by no means an easy task. In other words, the 'Allāmah made the completion of his work dependent upon these references. This constituted the main difficulty. Even if the brochure had been published in 'Allāmah's lifetime, the same problem would have to be tackled. Further, the lectures as taken down by the 'Allāmah's pupil were to be rearranged with reference to the text of the *Bukhārī* besides giving captions to the various chapters.

In view of the importance of the book and the contribution it would make towards the *Ḥadīth* in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent, we presistently strove to get it published and negotiations were conducted with numerous academic institutions and scholars interested in the work. These negotiations unfortunately failed because of serious difficulties which made everyone diffident. At last Mawlānā Shaj'ī al-Ḥasan (مد ظله العالی), my contemporary and fellow student at Deoband, took Mawlānā Faḍl-i-Ḥaq Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) to Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān. The latter naturally asked why the work had remained unpublished so for long. The difficulties in its publication were explained to him. Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) asked for time to examine the manuscript. When I called on him again, he had made up his mind and agreed to the financial proposition. But it was advised by some eminent scholars, particularly, by the 'Allāmah's disciples, that the benefit of the mere text would be limited only to those who are keenly interested in the literature on the Tradition. Moreover, there were certain portions where the expositions of the Tradition were either inadequate or absent. There was no doubt about the valuable nature of the lectures but these were not for the common reader. It was consequently decided by mutual consultation that the work based on the original lectures must be elaborated to highlight the 'Allāmah's scholarship. This work of collection and incorporation of the references has been performed by Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān with great industry and earnestness. It was dedicated that the full text of the *Aḥādīth* in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* should be incorporated along with diacritical marks so that the readers may recite them just like the Qur'ān. The translation of the Tradition by Mawlānā Waḥīd al-Zamān into Urdū was to be given side by side in the opposite column, a matter personally stressed by me, as the 'Allāmah liked this translation. The problem of a fresh translation of the *Bukhārī* also came up for consideration. But Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān regretted his inability to undertake this additional responsibility.

Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) deserves our profoundest thanks for checking up the references and comparing them with the originals. This alone bespeaks his dedication to and love for the cause of Islām. When Hakīm al-Islām Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyib (مد ظله العالی), Rector, Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband, visited Pakistan, he saw for himself the progress of the work and offered suggestions that might serve as guidelines. Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) also kept Qārī Ṭayyib (مد ظله العالی) informed of the progress through correspondence. The latter has given his appraisal of the 'Allāmah's work and we, therefore, need no further comment in this connection. It would suffice to reproduce an extract from Qārī Ṭayyib's (مد ظله العالی) letter to Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) on the completion of the first volume which says :

> May God maintain your zeal and dedication! The maxim: "every one is provided with facilites for the purpose he is created" fully befits you. He who devotes himself to the good of humanity has everything. Had geographical barriers not kept us apart, I would have co-operated with you with all my heart in this sacred venture. But now I can only pray for your success. However, if not physically, I am spiritually with you, as are all scholars of the Dār al-'Ulūm which is the result of the mutual association of learned people. All the learned and pious, living and dead, are with you, as in such a venture physical separation has no meaning whatsoever. Neither spacial nor temporal proximity is necessary for a spiritual and scholarly work like this. Please, therefore, go ahead with your work with the same dedicated spirit. God is with you. Even if such a work costs one's life the achievement would be worth a thousand blessings. All those who are lightening your burden, whether they belong to Karachi or to your native town (Rawalpindi) deserve my felicitations. The work which you have embarked upon is in fact my own and that of the Dār al-'Ulūm and everyone associated with you deserves our heart-felt gratitude.

By the grace of God, the 'Allāmah's desire has at last come to fruition and a priceless treasure on the Science of the Tradition is being presented to the public, of which learned scholars, students of the *Ḥadīth* and even lay readers interested in Islāmic literature could feel rightly proud. May the Almighty Allāh shower His Blessings on 'Qāḍī Abd al-Raḥmān who has exerted himself to the utmost in rescuing the work from oblivion. He has made good use of the education acquired at the Dār al-'Ulūm and facilitated the understanding of the *Ḥadīth*. There is a large number of exegeses of the Qur'ān in Urdū ; the same does not hold good about the Tradition. This deficiency has been made good by the present work. The 'Allāmah had earlier completed an exegesis of the Qur'ān called the *Fawāid-i-Qur'ān* (Benefits of the Qur'ān) after the death of the Shaykh al-Hind (رحمة الله عليه). Similarly, Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالي) has taken over the task of completing the commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* left by the 'Allāmah, a service which we are bound to acknowledge. Now the original lectures have been turned into an academic work of high order and I thank Mawlānā Qāḍī Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالي) from the depth of my heart for his painstaking efforts.

I pray to God to bestow His approbation on this votive offering, grant a higher status to Allāmah Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) and make this work a means for the well-being of the *ummah*. It is hoped that the succeeding volumes will maintain the same high standard. God will surely bless Mawlānā Qāḍī Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالي) for his efforts in bringing out the remaining volumes during his life-time.

I pray and the whole world echoes :
May be so this.

ایں دعا از من و از جملہ جہاں آمین باد

Muḥammad Yaḥyā Siddīqī
Karachi.
17th August, 1973

EXALTED

Hakim al-Islam Mawlana Qari Muhammad Tayyib

Rector, Dar al-Ulum, Deoband (India)

Such is the Bounty of Allāh وَذٰلِكَ فَضْلُ اللّٰهِ

I have before me the first volume of the Commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* by Shaykh al-Islām Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) and the views expressed about it by renowned scholars of Pakistan. There is no doubt that it is a very happy news and a good augury that a commentary of the *Aṣḥḥ al-Kutub b'ad Kitāb Allāh (Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī)* is coming out before the *ummah* after passing through the highly cultivated mind of an outstanding thinker and religious scholars of the day. It is enough to say about the excellence and authenticity of this Commentary that it has been written by an eminent scholar like Haḍrat 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه).

The more Almighty God had endowed the 'Allāmah with a bright mind and probing intellect. These became all the more brilliant by the light gained on the one hand, from spirtual insight resulting from strenuous exercises and practice, and on the other from the Qur'ān itself. Because of this he became an embodiment of knowledge and mysticism, extensive scholarship and deep insight. Hence his knowledge was very deep and saturated in the Qur'ān and *sunnāh*. A peculiar positive slant to his approach was provided by the scholarship which he imbibed from Haḍrat Qāsim al-'Ulūm Nānawtwī, and he often used to refer to his debt to Haḍrat Qāsim (رحمة الله عليه) by stating that had he not read Haḍrat Nānawtwī's writings, he would have been led astray towards *mu'tazilah* doctrines. Haḍrat Shaykh al-Hind's statement about Mawlānā Nānawtwī (رحمة الله عليه) was that even a dunce could be made into an intelligent being through his writings. Such gifted persons are very rare.

It is obvious more how brilliant a person would one be who possess, intelligence to such a high degree. Because of these varied qualifications and intellectual discipline, which had become 'Allāmah's second nature, he could steep himself in philosophy and theology as well as exoteric and esoteric knowledge. Hence, whatever the problem about the Tradition came before him, it acquired a logical and rational character. Such a mind would obviously be able to penetrate more deeply into the Qur'ān and the Tradition and to unravel their implications to which the commonality of mankind cannot have access. The 'Allāmah, therefore, acquired two singular distinctions : that of writing a commentary on the Qur'ān in Urdū which can be called unique in its own way and of preparing a commentary on the Tradition. The Arabic commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* written by the 'Allāmah under the title of the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* is a remarkable work which has wrung plaudits even from Arab countries. The Urdū commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* reflects the 'Allāmah's deep scholarship and love for knowledge and the *millat* would no doubt derive the utmost benefit from it.

What more greater blessing can one have than that he should expound the Qur'ān, the most authentic of the Divine Books ; the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, the most authentic work after the Qur'ān and the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, which ranks next to the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. It seems as if he was providentially destined to render this triple service to the cause of Islām.

> وَذٰلِكَ فَضْلُ اللّٰهِ يُؤْتِيْهِ مَنْ يَّشَآءُ
>
> Such is the bounty of Allāh, which He
> bestoweth upon whom He will
> (Qur'ān 57:21)

What better appellation could the 'Allāmah have given to such a choice work on sacred matters than *Faḍl Allāh* as he himself was an embodiment of God's blessings and not only his original name happened to be *Faḍl Allāh* but the favours bestowed upon him also constitute God's blessings? In fact this *āyah* which I have quoted is fully applicable to him both nominally and conventionally, superimposing the applause upon another. In keeping with the excerpt from this Qur'ānic verse, it was thought befitting to caption this cursory appraisal of the 'Allāmah's scholarship as the *Faḍl al-Bārī*. May the Almighty God shower his blessings on Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān who undertook the overall arrangement of the book, fixed the headings of the chapters, and furnished translations of the reference material. Destiny had him marked for this noble work. While 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) deserves the *millat's* gratitude for unravelling the difficult knots of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in a lucid manner thereby providing healthy matter for its nourishment, it is no less beholden to Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) for enabling *ummah* to derive benefit from these invaluable treasures of learing.

> وَالدَّالُّ عَلَى الْخَيْرِ كَفَاعِلِهٖ، فَجَزَاهُمُ اللّٰهُ اَحْسَنَ الْجَزَاءِ
>
> He who guides to virtue is like one who acts virtuously;
> requital ! may God grant him the best

May the remaining volumes of this book also appear in quick succession so that they may prove a source of light to us and add to our insight.

Muḥammad Ṭayyib
Rector, Dār ul-'Ulūm,
Deoband (India)

Shaykh al-Hadith Mawalana Muhammad Zakariya

Immediately after the publication of the *Faḍl al-Bārī*, Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (*Zīdā Majduhum*) took a few copies of the book to the holy city of Madīnah to consecrate them to the resting place of the Holy Prophet (*Sallay Allāhu alayhi wa sallam*) so that these could be enshrined there. Here Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (*Zīdā Majduhum*) met his teacher, Shaykh al-Hadīth Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyā (*Zīdā Majduhum*) and Mawlānā Muḥammad Manzur N'umanī (*Zīdā Majduhum*). Both of these divines read the *Faḍl al-Bārī* and expressed very favourable opinions about it. The views of Shaykh al-Hadīth Mawlānā Zakariyā (*Zīdā Majduhum*) are being reproduced below. While the book had been printed, it had yet to be bound, and the views of the Shaykh are being included as blessings. The readers will be thereby enabled to evaluate the overall nature of the work through the comments of the Mawlānā.

Praised be God and blessed be His most august Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

I had been hearing of the publication of the *Faḍl al-Bārī* (Commentary of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in Urdū) for about a year and a half, and was praying from time to time for its completion, printing, to the satisfaction of the readers and for the benefits that it would confer on the learned circles. In the beginning of the eleventh Muslim month of Dhiq'ādah Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) who was responsible for its arrangement and printing, came to Madīnah and presented to me a recently printed copy of the work. I was laid up with high fever. Still I could not resist the desire to listen to parts of the book. It is my prayer and one that wells up from the innermost recesses of my heart that his efforts may bear fruit. May he be blessed in the temporal world and the world Hereafter! May the scholars gain new insight from this book which is now before them! A Persian adage goes:

To shower eulogies on the sun is to shower them upon oneself.	مادح خورشید مادح خود است

This is what I feel when I write about 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه).

Be that as it may, Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān is to be felicitated for copying the notes and references prepared by the late 'Allāmah with utmost integrity and sedulousness. There is no doubt in their being most useful, but may I suggest that these references need not be reproduced in full but just succinctly. There is little reason to harbour the suspicion that those interested in such scholarly pursuits would not choose to refer back to the originals and there is every reason to believe that a full reproduction, while extremely useful in itself, will only lengthen tne text of the book. This might result in delay in printing.

May God bless Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān with a long life and may he see the completion of the task he has embraked upon!

Muḥammad Zakariyā
Dhiq'ādah 12 A. H. 1393
Madīnah Munawwarāh

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful

PANEGYRIC

By

The Learned Scholar, Sincere Friend, and Excellent Poet

Al-Shaykh Al-Sayyid Mahmud bin Nazir Al-Tarazi Al-Madani

(Lecturer at the Masjid-e-Nabawi, Madinah Munawwarah)

(May Allāh prolong his life to enable the scholars to benefit from him and may He continue to shower His blessings on the Muslims. Amen!)

صَحِيحُ إِمَامِ الْكُلِّ أَعْنِيْ مُحَمَّدًا   كِتَابٌ سَيَبْقٰى فِي الْعُصُوْرِ مُخَلَّدًا

1. The book, the *Ṣḥaīḥ Bukhārī*, by Imām al-Kul (Imām of all Imāms) Muḥammad Ibn Ismā'īl, is one that will endure for ever.

كِتَابٌ أَرَادَ اللّٰهُ كَوْنَ مَقَامِهٖ   بُعَيْدَ كِتَابِ اللّٰهِ فِي الْفَضْلِ وَالْهُدٰى

2. It ranks second only to the Holy Book in authority and guidance.

كِتَابٌ بِهٖ يَزْهُو النَّبِيُّ رَسُوْلُنَا   وَيُرْشِدُ أَنْ يُّنْمٰى إِلَيْهِ وَيُسْنَدَا

3. It is such that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) spoke highly of it in a dream[1] and directed to repose trust in it and to turn to it for guidance.

لَقَدْ رَزَقَ اللّٰهُ الْبُخَارِيَّ جَمْعَهٗ   فَأَبْدَاهُ عَمَّا لَمْ يَصِحَّ مُجَرَّدًا

4. God bestowed upon Imām Bukhārī the distinction of collecting *Aḥadīth*. He excluded from this collection all the sayings that did not bear proper testimony or authority.

أَئِمَّةُ دُنْيَا الْمُسْلِمِيْنَ جَمِيْعُهُمْ   بِهٖ عَرَفُوْهُ الْيَوْمَ شَيْخًا مُّمَجَّدًا

5. Because of this, the scholars of the Muslim world to-day acknowledge Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) as their leader and the foremost authority on the Tradition.

---

[1] Ḥāfiz Ibn Ḥajar (*may peace be upon him*) has stated that the Holy Prophet (*sallay Allāhu alayhi wa sallam*) asked Abū Zayd Narwāzī (*may peace be upon him*) in a dream, "How long would you go on teaching the Kitāb al-Shāf'ii and not my book" Abū Zayd (*may peace be upon him*) submitted, "O Prophet (*sallay Allāhu alayhi wa sallam*) of God! which book is that?" The Holy Prophet (*sallay Allāhu alayhi wa sallam*) replied, "Jāmi' Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl (Al-Bukhārī)".

(Introduction to the *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, Vol. II, p. 262).

وَيَعْتَرِفُ الْأَعْلَامُ فِىْ كُلِّ مَذْهَبٍ   بِأَنَّ ابْنَ إِسْمَاعِيْلَ حَبْرٌ تَفَرَّدَا

6. And the scholars of all the schools of jurisprudence[1] have acknowledged that Ibn Ismāī'l is non pareil.

وَيُكْرِمُهُ فِىْ كُلِّ عَصْرٍ إِمَامُهُ   وَيَمْدَحُ مَا أَبْقَاهُ فِى الدَّهْرِ سَرْمَدَا

7. The Imām of every age has praised him; and as long as this book lasts, it will receive admiration from all.

مَتٰى طَالَعَ الْإِنْسَانُ يَوْمًا صَحِيْحَهُ   يَجِدْ نَفْسَهُ فِىْ عَالَمِ الْإِنْسِ أَسْعَدَا

8. Whosoever reads this book will feel himself to be the most fortunate of human beings.

إِمَامٌ جَلِيْلٌ حَافِظٌ وَّمُحَدِّثٌ   أَفَادَ جَمِيْعَ الْمُسْلِمِيْنَ وَأَرْشَدَا

9. Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl is a venerable Imām and compiler and interpreter of the Tradition. From him the Muslims have benefited and received constant guidance.

بِهٖ عَالَمُ الْإِسْلَامِ يَفْخَرُ دَائِمًا   وَتَعْلِيْمُهُ يَجْرِىْ لَدَيْهِمْ مُؤَبَّدَا

10. The Islāmic world will always be proud of it and its teachings will endure for ever among the Muslims.

فَفِىْ كُلِّ عَصْرٍ يَخْدُمُوْنَ كِتَابَهُ   بِشَرْحٍ يُّزِيْلُ الشَّكَّ يُوْضِحُ مَقْصِدَا

11. In every age, commentaries on this book would be written, doubts dispelled and objectives explained.

لَقَدْ شَرَّفَ الْمَوْلٰى بُخَارٰى بِجَعْلِهَا   لِهٰذَا الْإِمَامِ الْأَكْبَرِ الْفَرْدِ مَوْلِدَا

12. God bestowed upon Bukhāra the honour of being the birth place of this Imām non pareil.

سَقَى اللّٰهُ يَا خَرْتَنْكُ حِصَّتَكَ الَّتِىْ   أَحَاطَتْ بِقَبْرٍ ضَمَّ شَخْصًا مُّؤَيَّدَا

13. O Khartank! Blessed be the soil that holds within its bosom the sacred remains of a man so great.

لَكُمْ أَهْلَ تُرْكِسْتَانَ حَقٌّ لِتَفْخَرُوْا   بِجَدٍّ رَوٰى عِلْمَ الرَّسُوْلِ وَأَسْنَدَا

14. O People of Turkistan! You have every right to pride yourself in a forbear who presented to the world an authentic book about the sayings, of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) habits and ways of living with such meticulous and painstaking authority.

جَزَى اللّٰهُ عَنْ دِيْنِ النَّبِىِّ مَشَائِخًا   بَنَوْا دُوْرَ تَعْلِيْمِ الْحَدِيْثِ مُجَدِّدَا

15. May God Almighty recompense, on behalf of His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and his followers, the savants who founded institutions for imparting the *Ḥadīth*.

---

[1] That is, the four juridical schools, Shāf'ii, Ḥanafi, Ḥanbalī and Mālikī.

وَأَكْبَرُهَا فِي الْهِنْدِ فِي دِيُوبَنْدِهَا   وَخِرِّيجُهَا قَدْ كَانَ سَيْفًا مُّهَنَّدَا

16. One of these magnificent institutions is at Deoband, the scholars of wich are unsheathed swords on behalf of Islām.

وَأَبْدَى إِلٰهُ الْخَلْقِ مِنْهَا جَمَاعَةً   تَرَاهُمْ جَمِيْعًا رَاكِعِيْنَ وَسُجَّدَا

17. God has also produced a group of scholars among them whose sole avocation is to surrender to the Will of Allāh.

تَلَامِيْذُ شَيْخِ الْهِنْدِ أَبْطَالُ دِيْنِنَا   وَأُسْتَاذُهُمْ قَدْ كَانَ شَيْخًا مُّجَدِّدَا

18. The disciples of Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmud al-Ḥasan are the lion-hearted soldiers of Islām while he himself was the Revivalist of his age.

وَأَغْزَرُهُمْ عِلْمًا وَأَبْيَنُهُمْ هُدًى   وَأَجْمَلُهُمْ قَدْ كَانَ شَبِّيْرُ أَحْمَدَا

19. Among those who probed deep into the respository of guidance and implicit and explict aspects of Islām, one was Shabbīr Aḥmad.

وَكَانَ حَكِيْمًا فِي الْحَدِيْثِ مُفَسِّرًا   عَدِيْمَ نَظِيْرٍ فِي الْفَقَاهَةِ مُفْرِدَا

20. He was a scholar and commentator of the *Ḥadīth* and the Qur'ān, possessed remarkable insight in *fiqh* and had a unique juristic personality.

بَلِيْغًا أَدِيْبًا شَاعِرًا مُتَكَلِّمًا   فَصِيْحًا قَدِيْرًا فِي الْبَيَانِ مُسَدَّدَا

21. He was an eloquent speaker, distinguished writer, seized with scholarship and was master of oratorial exposition and lucidity of expression.

مُحِبًّا وَّفِيًّا عَاشِقًا لِّنَبِيِّهٖ   مُجِلًّا لَّهٗ فِيْ كُلِّ حَالٍ مُّقَلِّدَا

22. A devoted friend and an ardent lover of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), his life was swayed by his greatness and sense of fidelity to him.

فَطَالِعْ لَهٗ شَرْحَ الصَّحِيْحِ لِمُسْلِمٍ   تُصَدِّقْ بَيَانِيْ صِدْقَ قَوْلِيْ تَأَكُّدَا

23. Read his commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and it will surely bear testimony to what I say.

تَقَبَّلَ رَبِّيْ شَرْحَهٗ وَجِهَادَهٗ   فَمِنْهُ إِلٰى شَرْحِ الْبُخَارِيِّ أُرْشِدَا

24. God has accepted his commentary of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and his endeavours in this regard, as a result of which he was guided towards undertaking a commentary on *Bukhārī*.

وَذٰلِكَ شَرْحٌ فِيْ تَحَاوُرِ قَوْمِهٖ   يَكُوْنُ بِهٖ نَفْعُ الْإِفَادَةِ أَزْيَدَا

25. It is a commentary written in the language of his people, so that its benefits may not remain confined to a few.

وَلَمْ يَتَيَسَّرْ طَبْعُهٗ فِىْ حَيَاتِهٖ   وَلَمْ يَكُ بِالتَّصْحِيْحِ لِلنَّشْرِ اُعْتِدَا

26. The printing of the book could not take place during his life-time and it could not be revised for that purpose.

وَكَانَ لِهٰذَا الْاَمْرِ سِرٌّ لِرَبِّنَا   وَتَاْخِيْرُ رَبِّىْ كَانَ لِلنَّاسِ اَفْيَدَا

27. In this delay there was some divine purpose and this pre-ordainment proved in the end very useful.

اَرَادَ انْطِبَاعَ الشَّرْحِ مِنْ يَدِ عَالِمٍ   خَبِيْرٍ بِاَنْوَاعِ الْعُلُوْمِ تَزَوَّدَا

28. God ordained the completion of this commentary at the hands of one who possessed knowledge in all the relevant branches of Islamic learning.

وَكَانَ لِمَوْلَانَا حُسَيْنُ اَحْمَدُ الَّذِىْ   تُوُفِّىَ تِلْمِيْذًا رَشِيْدًا مُسَهَّدَا

29. The credit for bringing into reality, this objective goes to a favourite pupil of Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī (رحمة الله عليه) who was a sincere and devoted scholar.

وَوَالِدُهٗ قَدْ كَانَ يَدْعُوْ لِنَجْلِهٖ   لِيُرْزَقَ عِلْمًا وَّاتِّبَاعًا لِاَحْمَدَا

30. It was the earnest prayer of his father that he should be well versed in the knowledge of Islām and devotedly follow the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

فَتَرْبِيَةُ الْاُسْتَاذِ وَالْاَبِ اَثْمَرَا   فَصَارَ اَخُوْنَا عَالِمًا مُتَزَهِّدَا

31. The society of his teacher and the prayer of his father bore fruit and our brother turned to be a scholar and righteous man.

هَنِيْئًا لِقَاضِىْ عَبْدِ رَحْمَانَ خِدْمَةٌ   يَسُرُّ بِهَا الْمَوْلَى النَّبِىَّ مُحَمَّدَا

32. Felicitations on Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى), for by this service of his, he will please his master, the Prophet Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

قَدِ انْتَخَبَ الْاَعْلَامُ ذَاتَ جَنَابِهٖ   لِتَصْحِيْحِهٖ وَالطَّبْعِ وَاللّٰهُ اَيَّدَا

33. Men of insight and knowledge chose Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى) for this undertaking and God sustained and succoured him.

فَصَحَّحَ بِالتَّحْقِيْقِ مَتْنًا وَّشَرْحَهٗ   وَرَتَّبَ اَبْوَابًا وَعَنْوَنَ جَيِّدَا

34. So he revised and corrected the text and the commentary with great care and arranged the chapters and captions appositely.

وَرَاجَعَ فِىْ تَنْقِيْحِهٖ كُلَّ مَاْخَذٍ   فَكَمَّلَهٗ حَتّٰى اسْتَحَقَّ لِيُحْمَدَا

35. And in this analysis and examination he took recourse to every source and completed the work in a praiseworthy manner.

جَزٰى رَبُّهُ الْخَيْرٰتِ عَنَّا جَنَابَهٗ   وَوَالِدَهٗ نُوْرَ الْحُسَيْنِ مُؤَبَّدَا

36. May God requite him and his father, Mawlānā Nūr al-Ḥusayn (رحمة الله عليه), on our behalf.

وَ وَفَّقَنَا وَالْمُسْتَفِيْدِيْنَ كُلَّنَا   لِنَحْيٰ عَلَى التَّقْوٰى وَسُنَّةِ اَحْمَدَا

37. And may God inspire all of us and the beneficiaries to live according to the principles of piety and the model set by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

وَ اَوْجَدَ فِيْنَا عَالِمًا مُتَيَقِّظًا   لِمَا قَدْ اَصَابَ الْمُسْلِمِيْنَ وَهَدَّدَا

38. And may God produce among us enlightened scholars who have sagacity to foresee the dangers and tribulations that might befall the Muslims.

يُرِيْنَا رَشَادًا وَّاتِّقَاءً مِّنَ الْعِدٰى   وَيَعْمَلُ لِلْاِسْلَامِ فِيْ اَنْ يُّوَحَّدَا

39. And who show us the path of righteousness and rectitude, save us from our enemies and inspire us to work for Islam that it may generate unity among the Muslims.

وَصَلّٰى عَلٰى عِزِّ الْوُجُوْدِ مُحَمَّدٍ   وَاَصْحَابِهٖ وَالْاٰلِ مَا انْتَشَرَ الْهُدٰى

40. Ṣalāt-o-Salām on the Crowned Head of the living world, the Honour of the Earth and Time, Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and also on his offsprings and his comrades so long as the guidance is in vogue and who are the source of guidance.

مقدم هذه القصيدة اخوكم العاجز
خادم العلم بالمسجد النبوى الشريف
محمود بن نذير الطرازى عفى عنه   ١٦/ ١٠/ ١٣٦٢ھ

Mawlana Shams al-Haq Afghani

Formerly Head of the Department of Tafsir, Dar al-'Ulum, Deoband, and Jami'ah Islamiyah, Dabhel: presently, Head, Department of Tafsir, Jami'ah Islamiyah, Bahawalpur

While Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) has exercised meticulous care in reproducing in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* the most authoritative sayings of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) he has also dwelt upon matters of juridical interest and deep significance. He has derived implications from different *Aḥādīth* and divided them into chapters according to their themes together with excerpts from the Holy Qur'ān from which principles governing life could be deduced. Imām Bukhārī's quick wit, his remarkable memory and his vast scholarship are the other factors that elevate the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* to a level higher than that possessed by other books on the subject. Just as the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said about the Qur'ān "لاتنقضى عجائبه" (its wonders will never wane) similarly the *millat* (Muslim brotherhood) has averred its consensus about the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* by saying "لاتنقضی عجائبه" (its wonders never wane). 'Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn states that to annotate the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is an obligation of the *ummah*. The savants of the *ummah*, therefore, have made it the gravitational centre of all their collective attention and scholars of different ages have written commentaries on it according to their respective capabilities and expended their capacities in unravelling its mysteries.

Now this rich treasure of knowledge and spiritualism enshrined in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is coming to the *ummah* in the Urdu language. The gems of knowledge which come from a scholar of the calibre of 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) are by themselves a testimony of their importance. Study of the Holy Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* was the field in which the 'Allāmah especially excelled. I have gone through parts of the Commentary written by the 'Allāmah from one end to the other. Take, for instance, the doctrine of predestination. This is not only among the most baffling problems in the Muslim faith but one of the hardest that man's speculative and ratiocinative faculties can come across. The reason for difficulty in resolving this issue is the irreconciability between reason and authority. I have myself collected some material on it. But the 'Allāmah has advanced, through his remarkable intellectual grasp and eloquence, extremely cogent arguments towards its resolution. This shows that his contribution towards annotating the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is a singular one. The analogies, arguments, and deductions made by the 'Allāmah as well as the forceful language suitable to the theme under discussion, would impress the most sceptic amongst us. In short, in the sceptic world of today, the 'Allāmah's work is like a lighthouse. In the modern age of agnosticism publications like these are most essential; in fact, more so than they ever were. The publication of the 'Allāmah's full work would be rendering a great service to Islam.

The 'Allāmah's work, unfortunately, has so far been lying in the limbo of obscurity. All of us, particularly those specializing in the literature relating to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) should feel themselves beholden to Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى) for reshaping this work by fixing the headings subject-wise, comparison and collation of cross references given in the text with their original counterparts, translation into Urdu of the original references and the inclusion of Arabic excerpts alluded to by the 'Allāmah.

Preserving and treasuring the repositories of knowledge left by our forbears is a great service. I should like to felicitate Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى) for undertaking this arduous task and pray for God's succour to him in the completion of this enterprise.

Shams al-Ḥaq Afghānī
Jāmi'ah Islāmīyah
Bahawalpur
(*Ṣafr* 28, 1393 A.H.)

Mawlana Muhammad Yusuf Binnawri

Rector, Jami'ah 'Arabiyah, New Town, Karachi

God be praised and may peace and tranquillity repose upon the slaves whom He has chosen. Now to begin. The degree of authenticity and acceptance enjoyed by the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* among the compilations of the Traditions is known to all and the attention bestowed upon it by the *ummah* (may salutations and blessings be upon its founder) is evident from the number of commentaries written on it which next to those on the Qur'ān outnumber those on any other work. And since the degree of authenticity enjoyed by it is next to the Book of God, the *ummah* has paid so much attention to it that Muslim scholars throughout the ages have written many commentaries upon it and one feels astonished at the output which this book has generated. And just as the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has said about the Qur'ān "لاتنقضى عجائبه" (its wonders will never wane), the *millat* has also expressed a similar view about the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* "لاتنقضى عجائبه". Every scholar of the *Ḥadīth* and student of Islām has been, in his own way, expounding the points that arise in the Prophet's sayings according to his own understanding. And yet their significations have not been fully fathomed and more work needs to be done. Among the scholars of Deoband who rendered service in recent years, one was the pre-eminent scholar of his day, Mawlānā Muḥammad Anwar Shāh Kāshmīrī, who made a singular contribution to the expounding of this book and bringing out the deep and subtle significations contained in it. It was a momentous work which he alone could accomplish (may God bless him). Parts of this contribution have appeared in Arabic by the name of *Fayḍ al-Bārī*, published in Egypt, in four volumes. After him, 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) was chosen by God to undertake this work on the same lines. It was the earnest desire of Mawlānā Muḥammad Anwar Shāh (رحمة الله عليه) that just as Shaykh al-Islam 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmani had written a monumental book in Urdu on the significance of the Holy Qur'ān, similarly he should write a scholarly work on the subtleties of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in the same language for the benefit of the *ummah*. The 'Allāmah's approach in explaining the intricate points of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* during his discourses on this book, was so fresh and original and his language so lucid, elegant and exalting that no other previous exposition could equal it. While at the Jāmi'ah Islāmīyah, Dabhel, the 'Allāmah lectured on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* many a time with authoritative references, some of his advanced students took down his lectures. The 'Allāmah revised these notes with necessary corrections, and gave directions regarding the authoritative books to be consulted. The difficult and trying task of collating and referencing has been undertaken by our esteemed brother, Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān, a distinguished alumnus of Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband. This volume consists of the preliminary lectures in Urdu on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* spotlighting its invaluable treasures of knowledge and enlightenment :

لِلّٰہ الحمد ہر آں چیز کہ خاطر میخواست ⁂ آخر آمد ز پسِ پردۂ تقدیر پدید

Thank God, for what the heart desired has at last
come out of the lap of destiny.

Through the devoted efforts of my brother, Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى), a monumental work by the Shaykh al-Islām 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه), an erudite scholar of the day, eloquent spokesman of the *ummah*, and unrivalled researcher has been presented to the Muslim brothers. When I received the first volume I went through it with rapt attention and observed its internal and external merits.

Indeed, *Faḍl al-Bārī* as a commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, is a name befitting its great merits:

زِ فرق تا بقدم ہر کجا کہ مینگرم   کرشمہ دامنِ دل می کشد کہ جا اینجاست

From head to foot wherever I survey my beloved, the magical charm of
every part beckons to the heart that the object of attraction is here.

كَالْبَدْرِ مِنْ حَيْثُ الْتَفَتَّ رَأَيْتَهُ   يُهْدِي إِلَى عَيْنَيْكَ نُوْرًا ثَاقِبًا
كَالشَّمْسِ فِي كَبِدِ السَّمَاءِ وَضَوْءُهَا   يُغْشِي الْبِلَادَ مَشَارِقًا وَّمَغَارِبًا

Like the full moon to whichever part of it you turn your vision,
you will see it directing a glow of light towards your eyes. Like
the sun at its zenith in the firmament, its rays flood the countries
in the east and the west with warmth and illumination.

Ardent seekers and students of *Bukhārī* and lovers of the heritage of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) can fill their hearts with these gems of the purest ray serene. Heirs to the Prophet's heritage should be grateful to the Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالي) that through him these invaluable treasures are becoming a public property. May Allāh accept his service to the science of the *Ḥadīth* and make it a means to his attaining a rich requital and reaching soaring heights. And may Allāh's blessings be upon His friend, the Crown of all Creation—Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم), his Progeny and all his Companions.

Muḥammad Yūsuf Binnawrī
Wednesday, Shawwāl 17, 1393 A. H.
Madrasah-i-'Arabīyah,
New Town, Karachi

Mawlana Mufti Muhammad Shafi'

Rector, Dar al-'Ulum, Karachi

It does not beg description to pin-point the high position enjoyed by Shaykh al-Islām, Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) in theological learning, especially *Tafsīr*, *Ḥadīth* and discourse thereof as well as of the Qur'ān. The commentary which he wrote under the title *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is a work of such high order that it evoked praise from all the four corners of the Muslim world. He was blessed with a keen analytical mind and quest for research, but to this were added the twin gifts of lucidity and eloquence. The 'Allāmah (رحمة الله عليه) devoted a considerable period of his life to the preparation of commentaries on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* at Deoband and Dabhel. After the death of the great teacher, Mawlānā Muḥammad Anwar Shāh (رحمة الله عليه), lecturing on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* also came to the 'Allāmah's share. This continued for years together in the 'Allāmah's unique way. The more assiduous students of his took down his lectures. The 'Allāmah at last assigned the responsibility of taking down his lectures in writing to one of his brilliant students and while reviewing the written material, himself revised it, making alterations by means of necessary additions and excision. Thus was God pleased to have entrusted to the 'Allāmah the completion of the exegesis of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

The 'Allāmah (رحمة الله عليه) after migrating to Pakistan, was very keen to have the manuscript printed as early as possible, but his wish, because of supervention by death shortly afterwards, remained unfulfilled. Thus for a long, long time did the work remain hidden. May God bless Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) for the indefatigable labour and sheer hard work which he has put into editing this work and it is as the result of his efforts that the first volume has made its appearance.

It would be sheer temerity on my part to speak about the value of this commentary, since the 'Allāmah's name alone should be a guarantee sufficient unto itself. My regret, however, is that this work is making public appearance when I am bedridden and am a victim to many kinds of ailments. I could not therefore derive satisfactory benefit from the work. But quite a while ago I had the occasion to go through a part of the manuscript and I had had the singular privilege of having partaken in the printing of a remarkable article by the 'Allāmah (رحمة الله عليه) on the doctrine of predestination. It is my impression that these lectures represent a unique contribution to the exegesis of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in Urdu. There are certain subjects in it which are not found even in the Arabic reference books as regards eloquence and lucidity of presentation. It is hoped that, by the Grace of God, this commentary will satisfy and refresh many an avid scholar and serve Islam to an enviable degree.

The cause of Islamic learning would have been served even if the lectures were printed in their original form. But this would have been less satisfying. Therefore, Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) has re-arranged the work, fixed the chapter headings, quoted original references in full at many places and added explanatory footnotes wherever required. Although I have been prevented by old age and ailments from seeing the whole work, nevertheless, I have great respect for Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) and wish from the depth of my heart that God may requite him. I wish him all the best in the completion of the undertaking so that students of the science of the *Ḥadīth* may benefit from this remarkable work.

Muḥammad Shafi'
Shawwāl 16, 1393 A. H.

MAWLANA 'ABD AL-RAHMAN

(son of Mawlānā Muftī Muḥammad Ḥasan)

Rector, Jami'ah Ashrafiyah, Lahore

The superiority of Shaykh al-Islam 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) with regard to scholarship, capacity to elucidate, and ratiocinative ability has wrung testimonies from the scholars of the last half century in the subcontinent and in the Islamic world. The 'Allāmah first wrote glosses on the Qur'ān and commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, named the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*. Thereafter he directed attention to the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Scholars who had the occasion to meet the 'Allāmah towards the end of his life know how keenly he was engrossed in revising the manuscripts of the present work. Whenever anyone requested him to fulfil his promise to undertake a detailed commentary on the Qur'ān, he said that he was concentrating on the commentary of *Bukhārī*.

Shaykh al-Ḥadīth Mawlānā Idrīs Kandhlawī (مد ظله العالى) and other scholars repeatedly expressed their wish that this work should come out so that the scholars of exegesis and the *Ḥadīth* may derive full benefit from it. Mawlānā Muḥammad Yaḥyā Ṣiddīqī (مد ظله العالى) and other scholars invited Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى), who is an alumnus of Deoband, to undertake this venture, after which alone could printing be possible. There were hundreds of occasions where references were made to *Qasṭalānī*, *Kirmānī*, *'Umdah al-Qārī*, *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī*, *Fatḥ al-Mughīth lil-'Irāqī*, *A'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn*, *Zād al-Ma'ād*, *Aḥkām al-Qur'ān lil-Jaṣṣaṣ*, *Madārij al-Sālikīn* and many other books for purposes of revision. It was also essential that the comments which were apposite to the original text of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* should be relevant to the appropriate captions. Moreover, the fixation of chapter or sub-chapter headings was also a very perplexing task, keeping in view the high quality of scholarship of the 'Allāmah and the sacred nature of the work. Wherever quotations were offered from the original references, it was necessary to collate them therewith. After composition, the book had to pass through the stages of correction. Only those who have had the occasion to reduce a study to an academic work would appreciate the almost insurmountable difficulties involved. Ḥakīm al-Islam Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyib (مد ظله العالى) has written in a recent letter of his on the selection of Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى) for this undertaking as follows:

> Mawlānā Muḥammad Yaḥyā (مد ظله العالى) has acted in time in entrusting this momentous task to Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى). May God grant him still higher places!

It was some twenty-one years ago in 1952 that I first met Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى). He requested my father, the late Mawlānā Muftī Muḥammad Ḥasan (رحمة الله عليه), to teach him the *Mathnawī* of Mawlānā Rūm, saying, 'Despite the fact that I have graduated from Deoband, I have had no teacher with whom I could study the *Mathnawī*.' My father said, 'It appears from your talk that you teach *Tafsīr*. Can you tell me the difference between the *Tafsīr-i-Bayān al-Qur'ān* by Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānwī (رحمة الله عليه) and the other commentaries on the Qur'ān?" Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān replied, 'After seeing the expositions of other commentators, one is led to the real trend of the subject-matter discussed in the *Tafsīr-i-Bayān al-Qur'ān*.' My father was very pleased with this reply and said, "Bring the first volume of the *Mathnawī*. I will surely teach you.'

It seems that God, the Prime Source of all Bounty, has graced Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى) with the felicity of dedication to the Qur'ān and the Tradition, perseverance, capacity to work and respect and affinity for the savants. I felicitate him and pray for God's blessings on him, here and hereafter, through the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Seeking your Grace, O the Most Gracious!

'Abd al-Raḥmān
Jāmi'ah Ashrafiyah,
Lahore

MAWLANA MUHAMMAD SALIM ALLAH KHAN

Rector, Jami'ah Faruqiyah, Karachi

Imām Bukhārī holds the most elevated position among Traditionists. He is without a peer as regards memory and collation, sound judgment and deductive ability, research and penetrating insight. He stands supreme in the memorization of the text of the *Ḥadīth*. Similarly, his pre-eminence is admitted on all hands in the matter of testing the chain of transmissional authorities, the procedure and all related sciences. Nature had chosen him from the very beginning for this momentous task. Therefore, he began to exert himself in this branch of learning from his very childhood and carried this art to such an extraordinary state of perfection by dint of his inborn ability that only one who is consumed by animosity or is obtuse in understanding can deny his greatness. From his time to this day, scholars of every age have been unanimous with regard to his greatness and glory. Besides his pre-eminence in learning and scholarship, the life of Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) testifies to his piety and God-consciousness, self-sacrifice, generosity and selflessness.

Imām Bukhārī is the author of many books, but the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* has a place of its own among them. It has been acknowledged as the most accurate book after the Book of God. Imām Bukhārī not only garnered the different *Aḥādīth* in the book but also devoted his attention to the problems and injunctions deducible from them. Imām Bukhārī is researcher absolute. He presents his juristic point of view through the captions themselves. That is why he divided his book into chapters under appropriate captions. He established his point of view in such convincing and novel ways that men of culture and learning, after going through the book repeatedly, turn to it again and again with renewed wonder and appreciation.

Scholars have suggested many principles for analysing the different sections of the book under various captions. These principles help in arriving at an understanding of the captions. Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī (رحمة الله عليه), a distinguished Traditionist of Delhi, and Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan (رحمة الله عليه) of Deoband have laid down certain guidelines for unravelling the captions. Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakarīya (مد ظله العالى), Shaykh al-Ḥadīth (Head Traditionist) of Mazāhir-i-'Ulūm, Saharanpur, also collated the principles of both the masters, Bukhārī and Muslim, in the introduction to his *Lām'i*, adding some principles of his own, and has brought the number of these principles to seventy. Similarly; Imām Bukhārī is punctiliously particular in quoting the appropriate Qur'ānic verses in captions under different chapters; underlining the purposes of annotations, he indicates as to which verse of the Qur'ān solves the problem suggested in the caption. This is in addition to a separate book of his entitled the *Kitāb al-Tafsīr* (Book of Interpretation). Matters of faith and belief, the Prophet's wars (*Maghāzī*), relevance and concordance of different verses, disorders and confusions, demerits and merits of men, formalities, etc. are the chapter headings and captions under which Traditions have been collated by the Imām. He has taken meticulous care to maintain this characteristic approach throughout. The book and its author have reached the pinnacle of fame and popularity. It is for this reason that anyone who has the good fortune to devote himself to the service of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in any manner becomes the envy of the age and deserving of mention, whether it be in the form of imparting lessons to the students, systematic revision, marginal notes, annotations of the Qur'ān or in any other manner.

The Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband, has produced scholars of such eminence in the present century that the like of them is hard to find. Such are Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan of Deoband, Hakīm al-Ummah Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānwī, 'Allāmah al-'Asr Mawlānā Muḥammad Anwar Shāh Kāshmīrī, Shaykh al-Islam Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī and Shaykh al-Islam Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمهم الله), all shining luminaries in the firmament of knowledge and erudition.

The marginal notes on the Qur'ān and the commentary named the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* by the last mentioned scholar, 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه), have long been guiding the scholars and exercising profound influence on them. Undoubtedly, these services to both the Qur'ān and the Tradition are of great moment and consequence. Further, the 'Allāmah's scholarly ability, his mind whetted by the wisdom of Qāsim Nānawtwī (رحمة الله عليه), his unique capacity for exposition and explanation and skill in resolving most intricate problems through examples and illustrations, lent great weight to his lectures on *Bukhārī*.

May God requite Mawlānā 'Azīz al-Ḥaq (مد ظله العالی) for his great pains and care in taking down notes of his lectures on the *Bukhārī*. Verily he has fully repaid his debt to his mentor by performing this task. The 'Allāmah had kept this collection with him for necessary revision and correction, and for this purpose he had also noted down many standard reference books on the Prophet's heritage. But since his death this work lay in abeyance. Now, at long last, it is attaining completion under the able guidance and supervision of our esteemed brother and highly intelligent scholar, Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی). No doubt, he has endeavoured his utmost to carry these notes to a high standard of excellence by the exercise of his judicious taste. His assiduous efforts in collating references in a scholarly manner and appropriate assortment of the material show how very successful he has been in presenting these invaluable treasures of learning in a complete work, thereby deserving thanks from all scholars. He is a classmate and fellow writer of mine. Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالی) and I completed the course of the *Ḥadīth* together at Deoband. I think these lectures of Shaykh al-Islām 'Uthmānī (مد ظله العالی) would, by the Grace of God, prove extremely useful and of inestimable value to scholars and students of the Nizāmī academic course providing them with satisfaction in respect of many problems, on innumerable occasions, which they cannot get anywhere else. They would also open new paths in respect of so many problems for the Urdu-reading public, making it realize what scholarship really means and in what way the scholars of Deoband have discharged their obligations *apropos* of its promotion and development. It is hoped that the 'Allāmah's research would prove a veritable rampart of defence against perversions of thoughts and understanding that are prevalent today.

I pray that God Almighty may by His Grace and Beneficence, bless the efforts of the initiator, compiler, reviser and collator of this book and make it a means of felicity for all Hereafter. Amen.

Muḥammad Salīm Allāh Khān, Jāmi'ah Fārūqiyah
Drigh Colony, Karachi-4.

Ramaḍān al-Mubārak 2, 1393 A. H.

Shaykh al-Islam Mawlana Shabbir Ahmad 'Uthmani
A Short Biographical Sketch.

By

Professor Anwar al-Hasan Sherkoti

While it is true that an individual's fame rests upon his good deeds and the noble life he has led, it is also true that it rests primarily on the significance of his life and works, and for this loftiness in acts and deeds is essential. An individual who performs significant deeds will automatically leave behind a blazing trail of memory and the future generations will be keen to know almost everything about him.

It would be hard to deny that the more significant and epoch-making the acts or thoughts of an individual, the more exalted, respected and greater would he be. And particularly those who study his achievement closely would remember him. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Imām Bukhārī, Imām Rāzī, Imām Ghazālī, Ibn al-'Arabī, Ibn Khaldūn, Mujaddid Alf-Thānī, Shāh Walī Allāh, Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz and Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim (رحمهم الله) have left their names embossed in gold on the pages of history because of their thoughts and acts:

ہرگز نہ میرد آنکہ دلش زندہ شد بعشق   ثبت است بر جریدہ عالم دوام ما

He whose heart is enlivened with love never dies ;
and so our name is written on the scroll of the universe for ever.

In the subcontinent, during the last era or earlier, Sayyid Aḥmad Shahīd, Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan, Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānwī, Mawlānā Muḥammad Anwar Shāh, Mawlānā 'Ubayd Allāh Sindhī, Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, Mawlānā Muftī Kifāyat Allāh, Mawlānā Aḥmad 'Alī and Sayyid Sulaymān Nadwī (رحمهم الله) have tended the garden of scholarship, planting odoriferous plants whose scent still refreshes us to-day. But there are also scholars whose names do not figure in history because they have not left any legacy by which we would remember them in formal writing. Thus, if one wishes to be remembered by posterity one should leave behind something by which he may be remembered, both for his deed and writing. One such name is that of Shaykh al-Islām 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) who was a scholar of Islam, a master of erudition, authority, and reason, whose gift of oratory and eloquence has been acknowledged by almost all his contemporaries. For this reason it is but essential that his name should be listed among the most famous Muslims.

Family background.

'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) was the scion of a learned family, which connects itself with Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān (رضی الله عنه). His father, Mawlānā Faḍl al-Raḥmān (رحمة الله عليه), a scholar well versed in Urdu literature, was a Deputy Inspector of Schools. The 'Allāmah was born in 1305 A.H. and lived to the age of 64 according to the Qamarī lunar mode of computation. He christened his child with the name of Faḍl Allāh which was later changed to Shabbīr Aḥmad, most probably due to the fact that he happened to be born during the first ten days of the honoured month of Muḥarram. It was this name with which he later achieved fame.

He left no issue but had a prodigious progeny in the form of accomplished scholars. These were his renowned pupils who received the benefit of his instruction mostly at Deoband or some at Dabhel. The names of some of these renowned scholars are : Mawlānā Manāẓar Aḥsan Gīlanī, Mawlānā Abū al-Ma'āthir Muḥammad Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān A'zamī, Mawlānā Muftī Muḥammad Shafī', Mawlānā Muḥammad Idrīs Kāndhlawī, Mawlānā Muḥammad Yūsuf Binnawrī, Mawlānā Muḥammad Manẓūr Nu'mānī and Mawlānā Ghulām Allāh Khān each one of whom is an institution of learning by himself.

Formal education and graduation.

In 1312 A.H. Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad 'Aẓīm of Deoband performed the *Bismillāh* ceremony of the child which initated him into reading. Two years later, in 1314 A.H., he became the pupil of Munshi Manẓūr Aḥmad of Deoband, a Teacher of Persian at the Dār al-'Ulūm, from whom he learned Persian. Mawlānā Muḥammad Yāsīn, Head Teacher at the Dār al-'Ulūm, taught him the more advanced Persian books. In 1319 A.H. he started his education in Arabic language at the Dār al-'Ulūm. His teachers in Arabic included such distinguished names as Mawlānā Muḥammad Yāsīn Sherkotī, Mawlānā Ghulām Rasūl Hazārvī, Mawlānā Ḥakīm Muḥammad Ḥasan of Deoband, and in particular, Ḥaḍrat Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan (رحمهم الله)—the last one is reputed for his incarceration in Malta. He completed his formal education in 1325 A.H. and won distinction in the *Ḥadīth*. Thereafter he taught for some time at the Dār al-'Ulūm Deoband and later became the Head Teacher of the Madrasa Fatehpuri at Delhi. Mawlānā Sayyid Sulaymān Nadvī, in his book *Yad-i-Raftagan*, has given some very interesting information about his education and his talents. He writes :

> It was during 1902 that he (Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī) was receiving his education at the Dār al-'Ulūm Deobond and the present writer at the Dār al-'Ulūm Nadva. This was the golden period of both these institutions. At the Dār al-'Ulūm Nadva, Mawlwī Sayyid Muḥammad Qāsim, who belonged to my home town, was my classmate as also a dear friend of mine. He had later migrated to the Dār al-'Ulūm Deoband at the instance of his father. He had a great knack for establishing students' unions and streamlining their activities through organisations. When at Deoband he had established a sort of union of the students to encourage their literary and debating activities. The young Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī who was of equal age and was endowed with the natural gifts of literary writing and oratory, used to take keen interest in the meetings. Later, when Mawlwī Sayyid Muḥammad Qāsim put forth a scheme for the amalgamation of Nadva and Deoband, he would refer to Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī in his letters written to me which also contained greetings for him, with the result that both of us became better acquainted with each other. It was during the period when both Deoband and Nadva had their own Journals "*Al-Qāsim*" and "*Al-Nadva*" respectively and our contributions used to appear in the Journals of our respective institutions. During those days he happened to visit Lucknow once on some errand and had the courtesy to call on me at my institution. This

was my first meeting with him during my student days. In 1906 I was graduated and at the function held on the occasion I made an extempore speech in Arabic which was greatly appreciated and much publicized in the Arabic schools of the day. Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī also completed his education at the same period and he became a teacher at Deoband and I at Nadva.

DABHEL

'Allāmah 'Uthmānī taught from 1328 to 1345 A.H. at Deoband, after which, because of special circumstances, he together with Mawlānā Anwar Shāh and Muftī 'Azīz al-Raḥmān (رحمهم الله), went to the Jām'iah Islāmīyāh, Dabhel, where he lectured on the *Bayḍāwī Sharīf* and the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. In 1352 A.H. Mawlānā Anwar Shāh succumbed to piles and the 'Allāmah took up the teaching of the *Tirmidhī* and the *Bukhārī*.

Participation in Islamic Conference of Makkah

In 1926 His Majesty Sultan 'Abd al-'Azīz (رحمة الله عليه) had called an Islamic Conference at Makkah. He had invited two delegations from India. 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī was one of the members of the delegation sent by the Jam'īyat al-'Ulama. Mawlānā Sayyid Sulaymān Nadvī, who headed the delegation sent by the *Khilāfat*, gave a lively account of 'Allāmah 'Uthmānī's visit to the Holy City. He writes in his book *Yād-i-Raftagan* :

> When Sultan 'Abd al-'Azīz (رحمة الله عليه) called at Makkah an Islamic Conference in 1926, I was privilged to head the delegation sent by the *Khilāfat*. The members of the delegation included Muḥammad 'Alī, Shaukat 'Alī, Shu'ayb Qurayshī and the delegation of the Jam'īyat al-'Ulama was headed by Mawlāna Kifāyat Allāh of Delhi whose members included Ḥafiẓ Aḥmad Sa'īd, Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī, Mawlānā 'Abd al-'Alīm Siddīqī and the late Mawlānā 'Irfān Ṣāhib. Both these delegations sailed in the same ship and, thus, I had an opportunity to see the deceased ('Allāmah 'Uthmānī) from very close quarters. He had a very fastidious nature which expressed itself every time he conducted himself. That is why his fellows had a special regard for him. A student from Yemen studying at Deoband attended on him throughout this journey to Hijāz. From Jeddah to Makkah we travelled in a lorry. When we approached Makkah he was as if in a trance. He had put on the *Aḥrām* which is known as *Qir'ān* and all others that type of *Aḥrām* which is called *Tamattu'*. As we drew nearer to Makkah tears had the better of him and he cried bitterly. This was his second Ḥajj. In Makkah the sessions of the Mu'tamar continued for a month or so and all of us took part in it and Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad did quite often also. During this tour it had dawned upon me that he had great command over spoken and written Arabic. Sultān 'Abd al-'Azīz gave audience to both the delegations, one from the *Khilāfat* and the other from the *Jam'īyat al-'Ulama* together and held conversation with the members on different topics. On this occasion Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad spoke so well and eloquently about the beliefs of the celebrities of Deoband and on juridical schools that Sultan 'Abd al-'Azīz listened to him with rapt attention.

JOURNEY TO HYDERABAD.

In 1928, the 'Allāmah visited Hyderabad, Deccan, and delivered several speeches which won the hearts of the citizens of that place. When the Niẓām heard about the speeches, he became keen to hear the 'Allāmah, which he did in the Makkī Masjid and liked his address very much. Later on he heard the 'Allāmah deliver a sermon and was all the more impressed. This was the period when the Niẓām was inclined towards *Tafḍīlīyyat* and there was a constant tug-of-war between the Muslim nobles and the ministers. The 'Allāmah, through his speeches, suppressed this schismatic tendency, changing the attitude of the Niẓām and the nobles. The 'Allāmah went to Hyderabad several times afterwards and the Niẓām held him in very high esteem. He was designated the Principal of the Dār al-'Ulūm 'Arabīyah, but, since the 'Allāmah had migrated to Pakistan, he could not accept this appointment.

BACK TO DEOBAND

In 1354 A.H. (1936 A.D.), the Governing Body of the Dār al-'Ulūm felt that the 'Allāmah should return there, and after a great deal of persuasion, the 'Allāmah acceded to the request. He taught at Dabhel all the same and visited Deoband frequently till at last he finally returned to his *alma mater*. In the meantime, he brought about a change for the better, both administratively and academically, at the Dār al-'Ulūm. It was at his suggestion that the Old Boys' Association of Dār al-'Ulūm was founded and its meetings were held in Delhi and Deoband. The Dār al-'Ulūm, meanwhile registered financial, academic and administrative progress. Seven years later (in 1361-62 A.H.) he relinquished his responsibilities at the Dār al-'Ulūm, of his own accord. The year 1942 was one of turmoil. The people of India had already risen against the British. Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī (رحمة الله عليه) and other leaders were arrested. The Dār al-'Ulūm itself could not escape the general turmoil. The students also participated in the political strife, and as a result of all this, the 'Allāmah retired.

THE 'ALLAMAH'S PARTICIPATION IN THE PAKISTAN MOVEMENT

Having left the Dār al-'Ulūm, 'Allāmah 'Uthmānī took up the teaching assignment again at Jām'iāh Islāmīyah, Dabhel. In early 1945, he returned to Deoband owing to a severe attack of arthritis and by the end of the year became actively associated with the country's political movement on a practical level. On 18th Ramaḍān 1366 A. H. (6th August 1947) the 'Allāmah left Deoband for Pakistan and Mawlānā I'mād al-Dīn and I had the privilege of meeting him for a short while at the Jullundhar Railway Station. On 14th August 1947 (27 Ramaḍān 1366 A. H., on the *Shab-i-Qadr*, Pakistan celebrated its independence, in which the 'Allāmah participated and later, at the request of the Quāid-i-A'zam (رحمة الله عليه) hoisted the flag of Pakistan. The 'Allāmah inaugurated the first session of the National Assembly by reciting:

Thou givest sovereignty unto whom Thou wilt, and Thou withdrawest sovereignty from whom Thou wilt. (Qur'ān, 3:26)

تُؤْتِي الْمُلْكَ مَنْ تَشَاءُ وَتَنْزِعُ الْمُلْكَ مِمَّنْ تَشَاءُ

It was his ambition to establish a religious institution in Pakistan on the pattern of the Dār al-'Ulūm, but could not implement it as he breathed his last before it could be given preliminary shape.

His association with the Pakistan movement is such a striking proof of his political sagacity as no historian of Pakistan can ignore. The services rendered by him in bringing to fruition Pakistan are worthy of being indelibly inscribed on the pages of the history of Pakistan. If one impartially writes the history of Pakistan it is impossible that the name of this unique scholar of Traditional and Rational Sciences and authoritative exponent of Inspirational Sciences (those relating to the Qur'ān and the Tradition), should not be included among the front-rank architects of Pakistan. If one analyzes the approach of the Shaykh al-Islam 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī in relation to the Pakistan movement, some very pertinent points emerge.

'Allāmah 'Uthmānī was vehemently opposed to the kind of nationalism that regarded the Hindu-Muslim unity as axiomatic. His view was that to deny the separate entity of a hundred million Muslims was a denial of reality; it would be a travesty of facts to promote the ideology of single nationhood. The Hindu and Muslim approaches to and views on life are so far apart that it is impossible for them to team up and undertake any positive effort. The 'Allāmah knew well the mentality of the Hindus and the sleight of hand practised upon the Muslims by them during the Khilāfat movement, the scars of their machinations being still evident. When the 'Allāmah made Pakistan his objective, he put forth the most reasonable and cogent arguments in its favour and his speeches were all through punctuated by such remarkable eloquence as they were largely instrumental in generating religious fervour amongst the Muslims and the *Kalimah* (expression of faith): "There is no God but Allāh and Muḥammad is His Prophet", became the rallying omphalos for the attainment of Pakistan. The movement soon gained momentum and made the Muslims oppose the Hindus rejecting the one-nation theory, as a result of which 'Allāmah Iqbāl's dream was after all realized, and Partition of the subcontinent took place. The Muslims of the subcontinent refused to accept the Hindu hegemony after throwing off the yoke of the British. Another stimulus which drove the 'Allāmah to this movement was the desire to create a *dār al-ḥarām* for the Muslims in the subcontinent so that all efforts could be directed to the establishment of a state where the work of promoting and propagating Isalm could be carried on without let or hindrance.

The Objectives Resolution was presented by the first Prime Minister of Pakistan, the late Liāquat 'Alī Khan, before the House which was seconded by the 'Allāmah on March 9, 1948, in the Constituent Assembly in a memorable speech, a masterpiece of scholarship, literary excellence, political acumen, as also from the viewpoint of *Sharī'ah*. He said :

> Many among us believe that it would be virtually impossible to bring about a *volte face* in our administration and approach, and the change brought about by announcing the establishment of Islamic law and system of Government,

will bring in its wake such a change in our social set-up as would wholly transform it. We shall have to produce new administrators, thinkers, and bureaucrats to run the new Constitution. All this would take a long time. I concede there is some substance in what they say. The proponents of the Islamic order are well alive to these problems. The objective of the announcement of the Islamic state and ideology is to make clear our real purpose and the ultimate goal of our journey, so that whatever step we take should bring us near it. It is quite obvious that this is a long and slow process and can only take place gradually. What, however, needs to be done immediately should be done forthwith and what requires patience and for which the circumstances at present are unfavourable, will not be immediately implemented: instead, efforts would be made, wisely and realistically to render the circumstances favourable. However, man can do only what he is capable of. This has been my contention throughout in my pre-Independence speeches and lectures. In the Lahore speech I had the occasion to point out that this high and noble objective, it is possible, may be attained in phases. Nevertheless, the second step would bring us closer to the final objective like the dispersal of the night gradually and inexorably before the advent of the morn or a chronic patient gradually regaining health as he can not recover overnight. Similarly, our nation would gradually march towards the meridian of complete recovery and freedom.

DEATH

Such veteran scholars are rarely born. The present exegesis of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* being completed by Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān, a student of Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī, (رحمة الله عليه) is the work of this very scholar. Like all mortal men 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) passed away on 21st *Ṣafr al-Muẓaffar*, 1369 A.H. (December 13, 1949) on Tuesday at 11.40 a.m. at Baghdad al-Jadīd, Bahawalpur, and was buried in the compound of Islamiya College, Karachi on the following day. The last rites were performed by Mawlānā Badr-i-'Ālam (رحمة الله عليه) and the obsequious prayers were led by Muftī Muḥammad Shafi' (مد ظله العالی). The whole of Pakistan went into mourning; offices were closed, and the whole country shed tears of blood. Obituary notes and articles were splashed in newspapers and periodicals. Radio Pakistan broadcast in the national hook-up speeches, discussions on his contributions, and his intimate reminiscences. Elegies poured in endless succession. The whole subcontinent, in short, was plunged in grief and sorrow.

Lo! we are Allāh's and lo! unto Him we are returning. (Qur'ān, 156:2) إِنَّا لِلَّٰهِ وَإِنَّا إِلَيْهِ رَاجِعُونَ

'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) was, indeed, an evergreen, ever blooming flower of the garden of learning whom the cruel hands of Death have snatched from us but its exhilarating fragrance will keep our minds always refreshed. The following *Qāt'ah* aptly applies to him:

أَخُ الْعِلْمِ حَيٌّ خَالِدٌ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِ   وَ أَوْصَالُهُ تَحْتَ التُّرَابِ رَمِيْمُ
وَذُو الْجَهْلِ مَيْتٌ وَهُوَ مَاشٍ عَلَى الثَّرٰى   يُظَنُّ مِنَ الْأَحْيَاءِ وَ هُوَ عَدِيْمُ

A man of learning lives for ever even if his physical parts become one with dust, whereas a living ignorant person is really dead. even though he moves about on the earth; despite being considered alive, in fact, he is dead.

TRIBUTES PAID TO THE 'ALLAMAH

Let me now direct the attention of the reader to the tributes which were paid to the 'Allāmah by different scholars and savants who were specialised in similar fields of knowledge. Let us first see what Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānwī (رحمة الله عليه) thought about him from an episode which concerned a syllabus committee appointed by the Jam'īyat al-Anṣār, Deoband, in connection with raising the standard of teaching at the Dār al-'Ulūm with respect to Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim's works and the special suitability of the 'Allāmah in giving lectures on them. In the Report of the *Mu'tamar al-Ansār* Mawlānā 'Ubayd Allāh Sindhī (رحمة الله عليه) writes:

> Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānwī (رحمة الله عليه), while discussing Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim's works, told Mawlānā Mawlwī Sayyid Murtaḍā Ḥasan that Mawlwī Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī had a special insight into Mawlānā Qāsim's works and that he, therefore, wanted to pass on his turban[1] to him, and that Mawlānā Sayyid Murtaḍa should announce this fact. The latter, of course, made public this decision about Mawlānā's elevation. After this the Mawlānā sought the permission of the Prince of Scholars, Mawlānā Sayyid Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan (رحمة الله عليه) and placed Mawlānā Qāsim's turban on the head of Mawlwī Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī.
>
> (Report of the *Mu'tamar al-Ansār*, Muradabad.)

'Allāmah 'Uthmānī had a placid and serene temperament and possessed the ability to explain difficult points, like his teacher, Mawlānā Qāsim (رحمة الله عليه), in the light of rationalism and ratiocination. This is known as '*Ilm al-kalām*.[2] About this characteristic of the 'Allāmah, Mawlānā 'Abd al-Mājīd Daryābādī (مد ظله العالي) writes :

> 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) was a great scholar, a very pleasing and spell-binding orator, exegete, and commentator of the Tradition in his day.
>
> (*Ṣidq*, Lucknow, December, 1949.)

After these statements, would it be too much to say that Shabbīr's glory was a reflection of Qāsim's scholarship? Besides enjoying this unique privilege of being Qāsim's successor, he was the educational adviser to his teacher, Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan (رحمة الله عليه), famed for his incarceration in Malta. The latter often chose him for dealing with scholarly discussions involving scholastic and polemical rejoinders. Sayyid Sulaymān Nadwī (رحمة الله عليه) writes :

---

[1] That is, to appoint him as his successor.

[2] That is, rhetoric, elocution and by extension, dialectics.

> So far as I can recall, the Shaykh al-Hind was released from incarceration in Malta the same year (1920 or in early 1921) along with his companions, among whom was Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī (رحمة الله عليه). But the Shaykh al-Hind did not live beyond a few months thereafter. He used to be invited by his admirers from all over the subcontinent, but he could not go himself. As his representative or spokesman he always deputed Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī. His deputation at the gathering at Delhi is memorable. He specially delivered a forceful speech on the issue of the renunciation of cow-slaughter—an issue that was raised by Ḥakīm Ajmal Khan (رحمة الله عليه). This speech on behalf of Shaykh al-Hind not only points to Mawlānā's greatness but also his devotion to his master.
>
> (*Ma'ārif*, April 1950, p. 300).

Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṭayyib (مد ظله العالی) says about the 'Allāmah:

> 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī was a repository of the scholarship which he had acquired from the senior scholars of the Dār al-'Ulūm. He possessed a deep insight into the knowledge bequeathed by the founder of the Dār al-'Ulūm, and delivered his lectures lucidly and cogently.
>
> (*Tajallīyat*, p. 405)

Mawlānā Muḥammad Miyān (مد ظله العالی), Member, Jam'īyat al-'Ulamā-i-Hind, reviewing the *Tafsīr-i-'Uthmānī*, says:

> This exegesis has been written by a scholar about whom the consensus of opinion of the Muslims of India is that, insofar as the understanding of the Qur'ān, intellectual insight, lucidity, sustained interest and general intellectual appeal are concerned, he, that is, the exegete of the age, Qāsim the Second, 'Allāmah Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه), commentator of the *Muslim Sharīf*, remains unsurpassed.
>
> (*Ibid*, p. 405)

In the above passage, the reference to "Qāsim the Second" is significant as Mawlānā Ashraf 'Alī Thānwī says about Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim :

> Ḥājī Imdād Allāh's thoughts have been interpreted by Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim. Ḥājī Imdād Allāh's purport was that every saint is granted a special exponent. His exponent was Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim (رحمة الله عليه).
>
> (*Al-Nūr*, *Sha'bān* 1352 A. H., p. 357)

This writer's view, therefore, is that just as Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim, on Mawlānā Thānwī's authority, was the exponent of Ḥājī Imdād Allāh, so was the 'Allāmah the exponent of Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim (رحمة الله عليه). This surrogateship was mainly scholastic, and the 'Allāmah often interpreted the ideas of Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim. The late Abū Sa'īd Bazmī, a former editor of *Madīnah*, Bijnor, and later of *Iḥsān*, Lahore, spoke rather significantly :

> The personality of Mawlānā 'Uthmānī was distinguished by his singular capacity to interpret and highlight the Islamic concepts, commands, edicts, and codes and their significance in the light of reason and the title of *Mutakallim-i-Islam* was unanimously conferred upon him from all parts of the undivided India.
>
> (Daily *Iḥsān*, Lahore, December 14, 1949.)

Thus, he was not only an exponent of the ideas of Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim and Shaykh al-Hind but a very forceful executive head of the external affairs of the Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband, and a very powerful controller of its internal affairs also. In effect, he was the *āyah* (sign) of one of God's *āyahs* (signs) and a great son of Islam. A similar view was expressed in the obituary statement by the then Sa'ūdī Ambassador in Pakistan :

> Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī was the interpreter of Islamic learning which is a source of pride and honour for the Islamic world. He was a synthesis of Islamic learning and unshakable faith. The idea of maintaining self-respect, *jihād* and the religious traditions of Islam was so much to the fore in him that the respect enjoyed by him reached new heights and he was considered unique in the age he lived.
>
> (Daily *Zamīndār*, Lahore, December 16, 1949.)

A foreigner held the 'Allāmah to be peerless in scholarship and ability in the contemporary times. In an editorial Abū Sa'īd Bazmī expresses a similar view:

> The 'Allāmah held so high a position among his contemporaries because of high character and scholarship, that, to speak nothing of Pakistan, he was without an equal in whole of the Islamic world.
>
> (Daily *Iḥsān*, Lahore, December 14, 1949.)

Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī (رحمة الله عليه), in his statement on the 'Allāmah's death, said:

> Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī's personality was unique. He was a scholar of high merit and one of the foremost amongst the scholars of the subcontinent. No one can deny the Mawlānā's scholarship and his magnetic personality. His position as an outstanding scholar is acknowledged on all hands. He had full command over writing and speech. He had, in short, great virtues.
>
> (Daily *Al-Jam'īyat*, Delhi, December 16, 1949.)

Thus, his scholarship was acknowledged in the whole world and he was respected both in India and outside.

'ALLAMAH'S WORKS

Among the more celebrated of the 'Allāmah's works are :

1. The *Tafsīr-i-'Uthmānī* which has been held to be a work of high order both in scholarship and interpretation. It has gone into several editions and is very popular to this day.
2. The *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*, which comprises several volumes of commentary on the *Muslim*.

This is his second major work which commands considerable respect from Muslims the world over. Mawlānā Anwar Shāh's view about it is as follows :

> No one indeed has been able to do better service to this book than Mawlānā Mawlwī Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī, the leading scholar of Muslim Tradition, exegete and master of erudition of the present age. As far as I know, no one else could accomplish this work in a better manner. He has, by taking up this subject, placed the learned under his debt.
>
> (Last page of the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*, Vol. I)

> لاجرم علامۂ عصرِ خود مولانا مولوی شبیر احمد
> عثمانی دیوبندی کہ محدث و مفسر و متکلم ایں عصر اند و
> در علم ایں احقر ہیچکس خدمت ایں کتاب بہتر و برتر
> ازیشاں نتوانست کرد، متوجہ ایں خدمت شدہ
> منت بر رقاب اہل علم نہادند۔

This view of Mawlānā Anwar Shāh, because of his profound and unquestioned scholarship, is like an indentation made on a stone as he is the last authority on the subject whose soundness of opinion and scholarship are acknowledged on all hands.

The Muslim world thus recognized the high merit of the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim,* and the present Rector of the Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband, Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyib (مد ظله العالی), stated in his condolence speech that this Arabic commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is a work that will command respect for ever throughout the Muslim world. Besides the above works, the 'Allāmah also wrote *Al-'Aql Wa-al-Naql* (Rationalism and Revelation), *Al-Islām, A'jāz al-Qur'ān* (the Miracle of the Qur'ān), *Al-Rūḥ fī al-Qur'ān* (The Meaning of the Soul in the Qur'ān), *Khawāriq 'Ādat* (Supernatural Phenomena), *Hadyah Sanīyāh* (The Sublime Gift) and *Al-Shihāb* (The Meteor) which are treatises too scholarly for the lay reader but are, all the same, masterpieces. The 'Allāmah's public addresses and sermons on the ideology of Pakistan have also been compiled and published under the title, *Khuṭbāt-i-'Uthmānī* (The Speeches of 'Uthmānī). Then there are his scholarly letters which have been collected and published under the title, *Anwār-i-'Uthmānī*.

We have just referred to the *Tafsīr-i-'Uthmānī* and the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* which would rank as permanent achievements and make the 'Allāmah a flower that should adorn the vase of history, but there is still another work of very high merit: the *Faḍl al-Bārī*, the Urdu commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of *Abī 'Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī*.

Faḍl al-Bārī Sharḥ Urdu Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī—the title of which was suggested by this writer—is a *tour de force* by the 'Allāmah. The first volume, out of the twelve contemplated, is before the reader. It would be a landmark in the science of Muslim Tradition and would occupy a special niche among the different commentaries on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. It would be especially beneficial to the teachers of the *Ḥadīth*. The reader should be able to judge for himself the merits of the book.

THE CHAPTERS (IN RELATION TO THE AHADITH)
Fixed by Imam Bukhari, his Interpretations, and 'Allamah 'Uthmani.

The headings of books that have been devised by Imām Bukhārī and the Tradition which he has discussed thereunder are connected with each other by means of a very close relationship. Commentators of the Tradition have considered this function of determining the concordance of one *ḥadīth* with a slightly different one a very serious problem and have discussed it at length. The 'Allāmah has also done the same thing, even though it is a very hard and delicate undertaking. He has succeeded in a singular manner in bringing out this concordance.

MAIN TRAITS OF THE *AḤĀDĪTH* AND 'ALLAMAH 'UTHMANI

Whether it is his commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (*Fatḥ al-Mulhim*) or on the *Bukhārī*, the 'Allāmah elaborates all the aspects of every *ḥadīth* thoroughly, as has been done by 'Allāmah Zāhid al-Kawtharī (رحمة الله عليه). The approach which he had adopted in the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* is also witnessed in the present commentary, the main traits of which are set out below :

1. Investigation of differences in matters of detail among the various Sunnite juristic schools and the presentation of versions which, as far as possible, minimize the differecne.
2. Account of the salient life events of the narrators of the *Aḥādīth* in relevant captions, citing the names of the more unfamiliar narrators as required, and economy in scrutiny as to veracity of the *Aḥādīth*.
3. Citations from original sources for clarification at places where there was either some difficulty or doubt.
4. Scrutiny of the words employed in the *Aḥādīth* and explanations of their significance or meaning.
5. Analecta from famous authoritative books on specific problems, so that their background is explained to the reader, and the arguments in favour of the problem are so many and so thorough that the students of the *Ḥadīth* need not have to refer to any other book. At times even the authorities outside the scope of the *Ḥadīth* have been brought in and unexpected support has been found in aid of a complex problem.
6. References to standard books on the implications of the *Sharī'ah*, e. g., those of Shāh Walī Allāh, Imām Ghazālī, Shaykh Muḥyi al-Dīn ibn al-'Arabī (رحمهم الله), and so on, together with extracts of their works so that the reader may, if he so wishes, refer to them.
7. Consolidation of the different discussions in the *Fatḥ al-Bārī* at one place, if the themes are identical.
8. Quotations from different authorities of the Ḥanafī school in order to clarify the problems that arise in this school of jurisprudence.
9. Putting into writing findings which were inherited orally from the teachers and famous scholars or which are found in works that are unfamiliar to the lay reader or were to be found in a language other than Arabic, together with their detailed discussion.
10. Findings that were not known until now and whose value would be evident only after perusal, and from which it would be seen that the conferment of benefits on the *millat* by God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has not been intermittent but, on the contrary, has been continuous.

11. Discussions of problems not for the sake of dialectics or sophistry, but such as would appeal to intellect and reason.
12. Employment of expressions like "I said" or "this humble one said", for discussing subjects and elucidation of such points with perspicuity and clarity so that no obfuscation of any kind may arise.
13. Efforts at reconciliation by discussing the different narratives, even though they might not be relevant to the *madhhab* (juridical school) concerned, through the narratives themselves and mention of the aim of such narrative, so that there is no contradiction.
14. Attempt on many occasions that the origin of the *Aḥādīth* is traced from the Qur'ān as far as possible.
15. Analysis of the arguments of the Ḥanafī school as well as those of the other schools and an unbiased discussion of their arguments and preference of one viewpoint over the other.
16. Problems not discussed or discussed cursorily have been marked so that the investigator may undertake a more detailed study on them.
17. Sceptical questions raised about the Tradition—especially in modern times—have been answered wherever necessary.[1]

These are some of the characteristic features of the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* which characterize the *Faḍl al-Bārī* as well. These are the 'Allāmah's significant distinctions which bespeak his artistic, technical, and scholarly approach to the Science of the *Ḥadīth*.

'Allāmah 'Uthmānī wanted to see the book published in his own lifetime. This was unfortunately not possible because of his sad demise. This unique commentary in the form of a manuscript was left in the possession of his brother, Bābū Faḍl-i-Ḥaq 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه). When I visited Karachi in May 1948, I met the 'Allāmah and discussed with him the completion of the work. He said he intended to take it up after his disentanglement from the problems which then confronted Pakistan. When I visited Karachi next in May 1951, the 'Allāmah had departed from the world of the flesh, and I met Bābū Faḍl-i-Ḥaq 'Uthmānī at his house situated at M.A. Jinnah Road. I went through the manuscript at different places and could not help admiring the 'Allāmah's approach; it is like an ocean whose waves have within them a treasure of the highest order of scholarship. The 'Allāmah, as should be expected, has particularly discussed the more important problems exhaustively. He had gone through the manuscript and had made marginal remarks and revisions. References were made to the original Arabic texts relating to the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*.

I mentioned about the manuscript to Mawlānā Yūsuf Binnawrī (مد ظله العالی) who became very keen to get it printed. He and his son-in-law, Mawlānā Ṭāsīn, Director, Majlis-i-'Ilmī, accompanied me to Bābū Faḍl-i-Ḥaq 'Uthmānī. All the pros and cons were discussed at length but due to certain unavoidable circumstances the book remained unprinted.

---

[1] *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* Vol. I, title, p. 4

QADI 'ABD AL-RAHMAN'S FELICITY

The felicity of seeing through the completion of this book was, however, reserved for Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى), an alumnus of Deoband. Bābū Faḍl-i-Ḥaq called upon the Qāḍī and an understanding was reached with respect to the manuscript. Since then the latter has devoted himself to the task of editing the book, arranging the reference material thereof, and translating the passages to which references were indicated on the glosses of the original manuscript, and he has even sat for some time at the Bāb-i-Jibrīl of the Masjid-i-Nabawī long upto the time of *tahajjud* prayers and the present work bespeaks his labour of love for the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). He has thus added to the excellence of the book to such an extent by his judiciousness and ingenuity that his contemporaries, the elite, the religious scholars and even his teachers have nothing but praise for the work. I have gone through several pages of the proofs and praise poured out of my heart for the service he has rendered. The following couplet is my inscription of praise for it :

مجھے انوار اس قسمت پہ سو سو بار رشک آیا   مرتب نے اسے ترتیب دے کر قرب حق پایا

How envious I felt, O Anwār, on this felicity of the editor who has
gained the nearness of the Almighty by reshaping and editing the book.

This book, besides being a reckonable addition to the Science of the *Ḥadīth*, will draw this branch of knowledge out of the four walls of theological schools and its message will reverberate throughout the length and breadth of this country.

A BRIEF LIFE-SKETCH OF THE EDITOR

Mawlānā Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān comes of a family which has been consistently devout. His father, Mawlwī Nūr Ḥusayn (رحمة الله عليه), was a very pious Muslim, and the same spirit inspires Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān who has remained throughout very devoted to his teachers and scholars from whom he has benefited, and he has had to make sacrifices because of his convictions. He has been a devoted disciple of Mawlānā 'Abd al-Qādir Raipurī (رحمة الله عليه) and Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakarīyā (مد ظله العالى). His association with Mawlānā Aḥmad 'Alī (رحمة الله عليه) is not nominal and he is furthering the former's mission with regard to the exegesis of the Qur'ān. Before going to Deoband to complete his study of the *Ḥadīth*, he studied books on philosophy and Arabic literature, as prescribed in the Niẓāmī Course, under a scholar of outstanding ability, Mawlānā Muḥammad Fāḍil Gujrātī (رحمة الله عليه); the present work reflects his training. He has great love and respect for his mentor who inducted him into the *Ḥadīth*—Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī (رحمة الله عليه). During the 1953 movement in connexion with the Finality of Prophethood he followed the lead of Mawlānā Sayyid 'Aṭā Allāh Shāh Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) and spent some time with him during imprisonment. He received the heart-breaking news of the death of his eldest son, 'Ubayd al-Raḥmān, while his wife and relations were sitting by his side in the prison. He was externed for one year because of his participation in the anti-Qādyānī movement. He has had several critical reverses in life but has remained unsullied insofar as compromise with respect to religious beliefs is concerned. Ordeals have the miracle of generating further resistance, and a man's progress depends upon his capacity to withstand the onslaughts of adversity :

جنوں میں عشق کے نکلے جو گھر سے   ادھر سے ہم چلے پتھر اُدھر سے

When seized by the fervour of love, I left my home,
stones were pelted on me as soon as I came out.

When the future compilers would write descriptive notes on the learned personalities of this country they would feel pride in mentioning the editor of the *Faḍl al-Bārī* who, guided by Allāh, concentrated all his talents on this remarkable work. He did his utmost to extract light from the aforesaid book of the late 'Allāmah 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) and spread it in all parts of the world.

We pray to Allāh that this important and sincere service of presenting the Traditions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in the present form by Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān (مد ظله العالى) may prove successful in all respects. On his part he is of the opinion that he could not do full justice to it, but we hope that by the Grace of Allāh it would be taken by the Islamic world in the same spirit as it should have been. It would also help him reap the harvest of this imperishable service in this world as well as in the world hereafter. We also pray to Almighty Allāh that He may grant peace to his parents, his teachers, his spiritual masters and colleagues and save them all from every kind of affliction in this world and in the world hereafter.

In the end we also pray to Allāh: may the tomb of 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (رحمة الله عليه) be kept lit for ever and be strewn by flowers of His Grace. Although the great religious scholar as he was, is not now physically present amongst us, but we fervently hope that his good deeds and religious services would be enough to give him an eternal life.

سالها، زمزمه پرداز، جهان خواهد بود   زین نواها که درین گنبد گردان زده است

For years the world will keep on chanting
these notes which he has raised under the sky.

I am sure that the book which we have with us is the fine fruit of these sacrifices and noble associations. May Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān complete the *Faḍl al-Bārī* in his lifetime! In fact God has created for him a means to perpetuate himself and have an abiding name, upon which I cannot help saying:

Such is the bounty of Allāh, which He
bestoweth upon whom He will (Qur'ān, 57:21)

وَذٰلِكَ فَضْلُ اللّٰهِ يُؤْتِيْهِ مَنْ يَّشَآءُ

11 Rabī' al-Ākhir, 1393 A.H. Muḥammad Anwār al-Ḥasan Sherkotī
(Tuesday, the 18th of May 1973) (Professor)

LIFE SKETCH

IMAM MUHAMMAD BIN ISMAIL BUKHARI

A Short Biography of Imam Muhammad bin Isma‘il Bukhari

اَلْحَمْدُ لِلّٰهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِيْنَ وَالصَّلٰوةُ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلٰى سَيِّدِ الْمُرْسَلِيْنَ وَعَلٰى اٰلِهٖ وَاَصْحَابِهٖ اَجْمَعِيْنَ

Praise be to Allāh, the Sustainer of the worlds, and peace upon the most exalted of Prophets and on all his Descendants and Companions.

Genealogy and Name

The full name of Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) is Muḥammad bin Isma‘īl bin Ibrāhīm bin Mughīrah bin Barūzbah al-Bukhārī al-Jua‘fī. His patronym is Abū ‘Abd Allāh and the title given to him out of respect by the whole Muslim world is the Amīr al-Muminīn fī al-Ḥadīth (The Commander of the Faithful in the Ḥadīth.) The great grandfather of Imām Bukhārī, Mughīrah, embraced Islām at the hands of Yaman Jua‘fī who was the Governor of Bukhara at that time. He then settled down in Bukhārā. It was the custom in those days that, if a person accepted Islām at one's hands[1], an association was established between the two known as *wilā* (kinship) and people also made this relationship a part of their names. Hence the Imām is also known as Jua‘fī. The ancestor of the Imām, Barūzbah, was a Magian, and nothing beyond this is known about him. The nature of the name shows him to be of Persian origin. Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has stated that Barūzbah followed the religion of his race, that is, the Zoroastrian religion, which leads to the inference that he was a fire-worshipper[2]. Despite all efforts the life of Ibrāhīm, the grandfather of the Imām, has also not been cleared of obscurity.

The Parents of the Imam

The father of Imām Bukhārī, Isma‘īl, was a prominent *Muḥaddith* (compiler of Traditions). Many scholars of the *Ḥadīth* refer to him, and he had had the privilege of learning at the feet of outstanding scholars like Imām Mālik and Ḥammād bin Zayd (رحمهما الله). Despite having been blessed with opulence, he was a devout and pious Muslim. One *muḥaddith*[3] narrates that he was present near the death-bed of Isma‘īl, who said : "I am leaving a great deal of wealth, but, by God, not even one *dirham* is of doubtful means." This shows how far gone he was in the path of piety, and, while these words may not appear magniloquent, their practical significance is great. It indicates the noble character which Imām Bukhārī inherited from his parents, and his being brought up in an atmosphere surcharged with piety, nobility, integrity and wholesomeness. This is how those intellectually great are brought up. Imām Bukhārī was thus uniquely fortunate in his parentage[4]; his mother was also very pious and devout. His father died when he was of a tender age and he owes his upbringing to his mother. He lost his sight while very young due to some illness. This grieved his mother beyond all description and she prayed to God for the recovery of his eyesight. She dreamt one night that the Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) and our Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) informed her that her prayers had been blessed with Acceptance by God and that her son would recover his eyesight. When she awoke in the morning, she found that her son had his eyesight restored. In fact, the Imām's eyesight became so sharp that he wrote out the manuscript of the *Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (Major Chronicle) during moon-lit nights.

---

[1] Also known as *bay‘at* in which the hands of the spiritual head are grasped as a symbol of allegiance by the disciple to establish the religious bond between the two.

[2] He might also have been a Turk (Uzbek) culturally belonging to Greater Persia.

[3] That is, a scholar of the *Ḥadīth*.

[4] The piety of the parents stands in good stead for the children both in this world and the Hereafter. Being useful in the Hereafter is mentioned in the Qur'ān : "And they who believe and whose seed follows them in faith because we cause their seed to join them (there)." 52:21. As for its positive results in the world, the incident of the Prophet Moses and Khiḍr (*may peace be upon them*) would testify to it where "And Thy Lord desired" is connected with "And the fathers of both were good."

Birth and Education

Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) was born on 13th Shawwāl, 194 A. H. after Friday prayers at Bukhārā. This in itself was a double honour, for the month of Shawwāl is a sacred one and Friday enjoys precedence in auspiciousness over all the other days. This shows that the date of birth of the Imām is also of special significance.

Once a pupil of the Imām, Abū Ja'far Warrāq queried him: "كيف كان بدء امرك": "How is it that you have achieved such a stature?" Bukhārī replied: "Because in my childhood I was imparted education in the memorization of the *ḥadīth*." He learnt by heart every *ḥadīth* he came across during his studentship, and from his childhood was devoted to the science of the Tradition to an extraordinary degree. It seems as if his Creator had him marked for this field of study. He completed his studies at the early age of ten; his proclivity towards the *Ḥadīth* kept on gaining in intensiveness and he became associated with the different schools of the *Ḥadīth*. His precocity, memory and mental alacrity were almost miraculous, and there are many incidents to highlight this fact. There was a *muḥaddith* by the name of Dākhilī, whose lectures Bukhārī attended. One day the teacher quoted as authority: Sufyān 'an Abī Zubayr 'an Ibrāhīm. Bukhārī objected that this was not so, since Abū Zubayr had not narrated the *ḥadīth* from Ibrāhīm. Dākhilī was a famous *muḥaddith* and did not like to be corrected by so young a pupil. He asked: "What did you say?" Bukhārī said: "The authorities are not correct; please refer to the original source, if you have it." Dākhilī, treating Bukhārī as a brash young pupil, unaware of his place, reprimanded him for his interruption. As the objection was, however, valid, he thinking that the oversight might have been his and the book might have carried the correct entry, took out the book, where also the entry was wrong. Dākhilī did not tell Bukhārī the correct authority, and instead asked him what were the correct authorities. Bukhārī said: "الزبير و هوبن عدى عن ابراهيم": "Al-Zubayr and he is the son of 'Adī, on the authority of Ibrāhīm." When Dākhilī heard this, he complimented him and had the entry corrected by Bukhārī with his own pen. Someone asked Bukhārī as to how old he was then, and Bukhārī replied that he was eleven at the time. This was the first incident that established Bukhārī's reputation for learning.

There are other incidents from the life of Bukhārī which etch out his remarkable memory. He was once attending a course on the *Ḥadīth*, and all his classmates, except he, had pen and notebooks. Bukhārī never took down anything. This prompted his classmates to ask him why he wasted his time. Many days passed during which some 15,000 *Aḥādīth* had been described at that institution. The students repeated their question and began to pester him. Bukhārī asked them to lay open their note-books before them and repeated correctly all the *Aḥādīth* in the same order as his teacher had narrated them. The students were aghast at this display of memory and those who had put down the entries wrongly, corrected them. This further went to enhance his reputation.

Bukhārī at first collected the *Aḥādīth* from the authorities at Bukhara. Among the scholars of the Tradition at that time were 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad Musnadī, Ibrāhīm bin Al-Ash'ath and Muḥammad bin Salām Baykandī[1] (رحمهم الله). It was during this period that Bukhārī memorized all the books by 'Abd Allāh bin Mubārak and even his teachers became aware of his remarkable memory with respect to the *Ḥadīth* and his outstanding abilities. They were always wary in his presence lest they should yield ground to him for being corrected. The celebrated teacher of Bukhārī, Baykandī, once said: "The presence of Muḥammad bin Isma'īl in my lectures on the *Ḥadīth* fills me with amazement." One day when Salīm bin Mujāhid came, Baykandī said to him: "Had you come earlier, I would have introduced to you a student who remembers 70,000 *Aḥādīth*." He was impressed to hear this and began to look for Bukhārī. When Salīm met Bukhārī, he asked him if that information was correct. Bukhārī replied: "This is no doubt true; in fact, I remember even more. And, if need be, I can give, in most cases, the names of the places where these narrators had settled down and the dates of their death. All the quotations that I have reproduced from the Companions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the *Tābi'īn*[2] can be linked by me with the relevant *āyāt* of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*." Although Baykandī was the Imām (Pontiff) of his age, still he requested Bukhārī to correct the errors in his book. When Baykandī's colleagues expressed their amazement over this, he said: "He (Bukhārī) has no equal." All these incidents relate to the period when Bukhārī had not left his native town for other places to acquire learning.

Imam Bukhari's Travels in Search of Traditions

The period of Bukhārī's studentship was the period of Islamic conquests. Hence, due to the expansion of the Islamic world, the persons knowing *Aḥādīth* had spread far and wide in various regions. So, in order to secure a *ḥadīth* or its authority, scholars had to travel over long distances. These travels are equated in the language of the *muḥaddithīn* with *riḥlat* (peregrination). The Companions and the vicarious followers of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) undertook numerous such journeys and for the sake of a single *ḥadīth* only, spent even a month in journeying. The Qur'ān in the *āyah* "لو لا نفر": "Why not a group of you..." (9:122) directs that journeys be undertaken to gain religious knowledge. The celebrated mystic, Ibrāhīm bin Adham (رحمة الله عليه), has stated in respect of such journeys that the blessings of the collectors of Traditions relieve the *ummah* of its calamities. Imām Bukhārī imbibed education till the age of 16 from the religious savants of Bukhārā, and in 210 A.H. embarked on *ḥajj* along with his mother and brother, Aḥmad. This was his first journey.

---

[1] An Iranian scholar who belonged to Baykand, a city reputed to have been built by Jamshīd, a legendary monarch of Persia.

[2] Those who had the felicity of meeting the Prophet's Companions and learnt about Islam through them.

Teachers of Bukhari in Makkah and Madinah

While his mother and brother returned after the performance of the *ḥajj*, Bukhārī decided to stay at Makkah in order to increase his knowledge about the life and the Tradition of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The holy city being the place where the Qur'ān was revealed, enjoyed a special distinction.

During Bukhārī's sojourn at Makkah, the prominent savants were Abū 'Abd Allāh bin Zubayr, 'Abd Allāh bin Yazīd, Abū Al-Walīd Aḥmad bin Al-Azraqī and Ismā'īl bin Salīm Al-Sāigh. Having learned from these scholars in 212 A.H. Bukhārī left for Madīnah, where 'Abd al-'Azīz bin 'Abd Allāh Al-Uwaysī, Ibrāhīm bin al-Mundhir, Muṭrif bin 'Abd Allāh, Abū Thābit Muḥammad bin 'Ubayd Allāh and Ibrāhīm bin Ḥamzah were held to be authorities on the *Ḥadīth*. These historical data show that Bukhārī stayed in Ḥijāz for six years but it did not comprise one journey only, and has to be divided into several.

Journeys after the Sojourns in Makkah and Madinah

After his stay in Madīnah, Bukhārī went to Baṣrah. By this time, his reputation had gone up so much that the news of his arrival spread in the whole city. He had gained so much fame as to have his itineraries regarded with the utmost eagerness by the denizens of the city he visited, and academic and scholarly discussions came to the fore. His memory and mental acumen were responsible for the spread of his fame, and he was flanked by the students of the *Ḥadīth*. Baṣrah at that time was a known repository of memorable successors of the Companions and *Tabi'īn* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). They could not but express their amazement when they saw an unexpectedly youngman combined in himself at such early age, extraordinary scholarship and erudition. The scholars of the city made arrangements for a scholarly gathering and Bukhārī was requested by the prominent doctors and *muḥaddithīn* of the city to participate in it.[1] Bukhārī accepted the invitation and showed humility on the occasion. At the gathering he said that he would recite the *Aḥādīth* which bear the *isnād* of Baṣrah, and that would be of benefit to those present. He then recited these *Aḥādīth* so that all those present were amazed at his knowledge and bowed in respect to him. Historians have also quoted Bukhārī's statement that he travelled to Baṣrah four times. When he went to Baṣrah for the first time, the famous *muḥaddithīn* residing in that city were Abū al-Walīd al-Ṭiyālisī, Ṣafwān bin 'Isā, Abū 'Āṣim al-Nabīl, Muḥammad bin 'Ararah, Sulaymān bin Ḥarb, Ḥarmī bin 'Ammārah, 'Affān bin Muslim and Muḥammad bin Sinān (رحمهم الله) from whom he acquired further *Aḥādīth*.

---

[1] This was an age of arguments and disquisitions, e.g., verbal battles between the different juristic schools and arguments and counter-arguments between the Mu'tazilite and the Ash'arite schools of theology.

From Baṣrah Bukhārī went to Kūfah. His famous statement regarding his journey to Kūfah and Baghdād, which has been copied by Warrāq, is :

> It is beyond me to estimate how many times I have been to Kūfah and Baghdād in the company of the *muḥaddithīn*.
>
> لَا أُحْصِي كَمْ دَخَلْتُ إِلَى الْكُوفَةِ وَ
> بَغْدَادَ مَعَ الْمُحَدِّثِيْنَ۔

Imām Nawawī, in his *Tahdhīb-al-Asmā'* (The Enlistment of the Narrators' Names), has described the names of the scholars on whom Bukhārī has relied. The most celebrated of them are 'Amr bin Ḥafṣ, Ṭalq bin Ghanām, Sa'īd bin Ḥafṣ, Ismā'īl bin Abān, Khālid bin Mukhallad, Al-Ḥasan bin Rabī', Aḥmad bin Ya'qūb, Abū Na'īm, 'Abd Allāh bin Mūsā, Qabīṣah bin 'Uqbah and 'Urwah. Baghdād being the capital of the Abbasid Caliphate was the cradle of learning and culture; it was for this reason that Bukhārī frequently repaired to Baghdād. His search for *Aḥādīth* and the transmissional chain of authorities *(isnād)* led him far afield from his home. After Makkah, Madīnah, Baṣrah, and Kūfah, where he learned from scholars well versed in the transmissional chain of each *ḥadīth*, he finally came to Baghdād to glean the flowers of knowledge. There the *shaykhs* and scholars of the city decided to assess the soundness and depth of his knowledge. A special meeting was called for this purpose. The *shaykhs* decided to put Bukhārī to a test, and ten *muḥaddithīn* were selected to put questions to him. Each *muḥaddith* recited ten *Aḥādīth* in which the text was deliberately distorted or inverted and the transmissional chain had also been distorted or altered. Bukhārī listened to the *Aḥadīth* very carefully. His remarkable memory is evidenced by the fact that although he heard the altered *Aḥadīth* for the first time, nevertheless, he managed instantly to recite the *Aḥādīth* in their correct order. He addressed the first narrator and pointed out the alterations in the text of the *Aḥādīth* quoted and their transmissional chains. He finally recited the one hundred *Aḥādīth* in their correct form and order along with the *isnād*. The gathering was dumbfounded by this display and everyone present carried with him an indelible impression about Bukhārī. Among the *muḥaddithīn* of Baghdād who enjoyed universal fame were Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, Sarīj bin Al-Nu'mān, Muḥammad bin 'Isā, Al-Ṣabbāgh and Muḥammad bin Ṣāiq. In the *Taqyyīd al-Muhmal*, Shaykh Abū 'Alī Ghassānī has referred to Bukhārī's visit to Imām Ḥanbal before leaving Baghdād, and how the great Imām expressed his deep sorrow at his departure. Bukhārī then visited Syria for acquiring knowledge where he met noted scholars like Ḥaywah bin Sharayīh, Ḥakam bin Nāfi', Ādam bin abī Ayās, Abū Naṣr Isḥāq bin Ibrāhīm and Yūsuf Fāryābī. In Egypt he met amongst others the *shaykhs*, Yaḥyā bin 'Abd Allāh, Aḥmad bin Shu'ayb, 'Uthmān bin Al-ṣāigh, Aḥmad bin Ṣāliḥ, Sa'īd bin Abī Maryam, 'Abd Allāh bin Ṣāliḥ, and Sa'īd bin Kathīr. Thus Bukhārī traversed the whole of the Muslim world in quest of the *Aḥādīth* and their transmissional chains. Ja'far bin Muḥammad Ḥaṭān has reproduced Bukhārī's statement that he had, within his lifetime, heard *Aḥādīth* from more than a thousand *muḥaddithīn* and that each *ḥadīth* he had was fully backed by *isnād*.

The Rank of Imam Bukhari in the Science of the Tradition

Muslim mystics believe that there are two kinds of seekers. One kind is known as the *abū al-ḥāl* (the father or master of ecstasy). They exercise control over their subjective states, impulses and passions.

They are also called *aṣḥāb-i-tamkīn* (men of prowess). The other kind is known in the mystic parlance as *ibn al-ḥāl* (children, that is, subjects of ecstasy). They succumb to their trance and are called *aṣḥāb-i-talwīn* (wavering persons). On this analogy the masters in any field can also be divided into two categories, namely, those that have mastery over an art to such an extent that they can mould it according to their will; the second comprises those who, despite their knowledge and learning, cannot acquire mastery over the art; on the other hand, it is the art that takes mastery over them. Bukhārī belongs to the first category. His book, the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, shows his complete domination over the science of *Ḥadīth*. He has the whole treasurehouse of the *Aḥādīth* before him, and can prove or disprove any point on the strength of the knowledge he possesses about them. This is the difference between *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*. Bukhārī has written a book named the *Kitāb al-Hibah* on the subject of endowments. Imām Wakī‘ bin al-Jarāh and ‘Abd Allāh bin Mubārak have also written on the same subject, but whereas Wakī‘ bin al-Jarāh has been able to reproduce only two *Aḥādīth (Ma‘rūf)* that go back to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and ‘Abd Allāh bin al-Mubārak only five *Aḥādīth*, Bukhārī has come out with an array of five hundred *Aḥādīth*. This is only one instance showing how superior Bukhārī is as compared to such famous *muḥaddithīn* as Wakī‘ and al-Mubārak. Bukhārī had a tutor, Shaykh Fāryābī, whose lectures he sometimes attended. One day Fāryābī read the transmissional chain of one *ḥadīth* as follows: "This Tradition is on the authority of Sufyān on the authority of Ibn ‘Urwah on the authority of Abī Al-Khaṭṭab on the authority of Abī Ḥamzah who heard it from the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)." The students could not identify any authority after Sufyān, as the latter had the idiosyncrasy of testing the knowledge of his students by using patronyms of the authorities who were more celebrated by their own names and *vice versa*. Thus, he was able to adjudge the students' capacity to relate each *Ḥadīth* with its proper source and his mental alertness. Fāryābī, on this occasion, described the enigmatic approach of Sufyān to his students, to their great amazement. But Bukhārī was not the one to be daunted. He stood up and offered his exegesis: "Sufyān on the authority of Ma‘mar bin Rāshid on the authority of Qatādah bin D‘āmah on the authority of Anas bin Mālik from the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)." In this way Bukhārī was able to explain that Abū ‘Urwah was Ma‘mar bin Rāshid, Abī al-Khaṭṭāb, was the attributive name of Qatādah and Abū Ḥamzah that of Anas bin Mālik. Every one present was astonished at Bukhārī's presence of mind and precision.

Faḍlak Rāzī, a famous *muḥaddith*, was once asked which of the two, Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl Bukhārī or Abū Dhar‘ah, was the greater scholar of the Tradition. Rāzī replied: "I had the privilege of meeting Imām Bukhārī between Ḥalwān and Baghdād. I changed the course of my journey and accompanied him. During this long journey I was by his side. All the while I was keen to recite before him some *Aḥādīth* which might have escaped him, but was utterly unsuccessful in my effort. As for Abū Dhar‘ah, I can recite several *Aḥādīth* which he does not know, although no one can deny his greatness as a *muḥaddith*, especially as he was one of the teachers of Tirmidhī, Ibn Mājah and Nisā'ī."

The life of Imām Bukhārī abounds in such incidents. From his life and works, it would appear as if through a miraculous transformation, the Science of the Tradition, so difficult and trying, had been facilitated for him by his Creator. Such are the ways of God that if He wills that someone may serve Him, then He facilitates things for him. This has been alluded to in the Qur'ān in the *āyah* : "فسنيسره، لليسرى" "Surely We will ease his way unto the state of ease." There is also a *ḥadīth* to this effect : "كل ميسر لما خلق له" "Everything is made easy to a person for the purpose he is created."

Bukhārī has cited in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Ḥasan bin Abī Sinān Tābi'ī that he had not seen anything more easy than piety and abstinence, for piety means only this : "دع ما يريبک الی ما لا يريبک" "Whatever is hazardous you should avoid and whatever is not so, you should adopt." This is, on the face of it, far from being difficult. But everyone knows that piety and abstinence are the hardest to achieve, but for the chosen ones like Ḥassān, God has made its attainment none too difficult. A poet has said about Imām Abū Dā'ūd :

لَانَ الْحَدِيثُ وَعِلْمُهُ بِكَمَالِهِ   لِاِمَامِ اَهْلِيهِ اَبِىْ دَاؤُدَ
مِثْلَ الَّذِى لَانَ الْحَدِيدُ وَسَبْكُهُ   لِنَبِىِّ اَهْلِ زَمَانِهِ دَاؤُدَ

Ḥadīth and the Science of the Tradition, with all their splendour, became pliant for Abū Dā'ūd, the *muḥaddith par excellence* ; in the same manner as the melting of iron became easy for the Prophet Dā'ūd.

Some *muḥaddithīn* have been impressed to such an extent by Bukhārī that they have coined the expression "لم يخلق الا للحديث", that is, God sent him into our mortal world just for doing work on the Tradition. There was once a man who could reach Delhi from Nanawta within a day on foot. When the late Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtwi asked him how he could do this, he was taken aback by this question.

The Method of Argumentation and Evaluation Adopted by Bukhari

While the revered *muḥaddithīn* have tried to record and preserve the sayings, the acts and the message of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) as well as his demeanour at the same time they have placed before themselves high standards for the determination of their veracity, and ensuring scrutiny, examination and investigation with due care. This process of sifting, examination and bringing the *Aḥādīth* in conformity with the Qur'ān, and finding if anything remiss was suspected in the source or the putative *ḥadīth* itself *(ta'dīl)*, had commenced during the time of the Companions themselves. And, by the Grace of God, this was the measure which ensured that the Companions and the preceding generations *(al-salaf)* had bequeathed the treasure of the Qur'ān and *Aḥādīth* to the coming generations *(al-khalaf)*. The truthfulness, personality, and the veracity of the authority leading to the transmissional chain that ends with the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) were the measures for testing the genuineness of a *Ḥadīth*. This was the norm adopted by the Companions. When the Science of the Tradition was put on a proper plane during the Pious Caliphate, the evaluatory measures also began to be practised on a sound footing. As the time-gap between the age of the Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) and posterity began to grow wider, the evaluation necessarily became more strict and exacting.

The approach adopted by the latter-day *muḥaddithīn* was based on that laid down by the first two Pious Caliphs. While the *muḥaddithīn* of the first three generations after the time of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) regarded every saying attributed to him with utmost respect, they were unsparing in their examination of the narrators (*ruwāt-i-ḥadīth*). Bukhārī was the leader, *par excellence*, of this approach. Many felt displeased with him, because he did not accept the authorities without being questioned. But, on the other hand, by the same token, a *Ḥadīth* that has passed through Bukhārī's hands, enjoys the stamp of genuineness in the eyes of the *muḥaddithīn*.

It is an extremely delicate operation to decide upon the reliability of the source of a *Ḥadīth* or to call that source a dubious one. A group of mystics has adhered to the view that critical assessment is prohibited according to "لايغتب بعضكم بعضاً" "Let not some of you slander others and this amounts to calumny." But the fact is that such an attitude is based upon an unrealistic approach. It is true that Islam has forbidden Muslims from suspecting others or prying into their affairs, but at the same time the need of it cannot be denied in certain cases. This need, too, is felt because of urgent religious considerations. Hence the need of such investigation and inquiry is felt in the case of the *Aḥadīth* also. It is said that even among upright persons in early times there was a class of persons who considered the making of the *Aḥādīth* a matter of virtue and devotion and to frame them in respect of the excellence of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). As the number of transmissional links began to record a sharp increase in course of time, their critical assessment also began to correspondingly increase in intensity.

It goes to the credit of Bukhārī that, despite the rigid principles he has adopted in assessing the transmissional chain, he has not used the words *kadhdhāb* (liar) and *waddā'* (fabricator) as the other *muḥaddithīn* are wont to. On the other hand, he is very circumspect in this regard. Whenever he considers refutation absolutely essential, he uses the expression, *munkir al-ḥadīth* (negator of the *ḥadīth*). With regard to calumny also Bukhārī has exercised the utmost circumspection and his abstinence in this regard is proverbial. He used to say that on the Doomsday, he would not be brought before the Bar of Judgment on this count. His remark in this behalf is worth reproducing :

Ever since I learned that calumny is forbidden, I have not resorted to it.

مَا اغْتَبْتُ مُنْذُ عَلِمْتُ أَنَّ الْغِيْبَةَ حَرَامٌ

With the same loftiness of spirit he remarks :

Whenever I call anyone the negator of a *Ḥadīth* I mean that the ascription of the transmissional chain to him is not justified.

كُلُّ مَنْ قُلْتُ فِيْهِ مُنْكَرُ الْحَدِيْثِ لَا تَحِلُّ الرِّوَايَةُ عَنْهُ

Bukhari's Role Regarding *Asma'*[1] *al-Ruwāt* and *'Ilal*

This is why the knowledge of disqualifying factors in the Science of the Tradition is an important branch of study. In the terminology of the *muḥaddithīn*, *'illat* is a discrepancy which impairs the soundness of a *ḥadīth*. It carries special importance with regard to the study of the

---

[1] Names of the the transmitters of the *Aḥādīth*.

Aḥāīdth besides other Sciences of the Tradition because it requires a discerning intellect and prodigious memory to trace out the mutual intercourse of the narrators, their dates of birth and death, their familial names or titles, their credibility and reputation, and ensure that the words employed in a particular *Ḥadīth* through different channels, are fully preserved. Bukhārī's skill in this particular field has a distinct character of its own.

Ḥāfiẓ Aḥmad bin Ḥamadūn has mentioned that he met Bukhārī during the funeral prayers of 'Uthmān Abū Sa'īd bin Marwān. There Imām Muḥammad bin Yaḥyā Dhahlī put questions in respect of the *asmā' al-rijāl* (Names of the members of the transmissional chains) and the *'ilal*[1] of the *Aḥādīth*. Bukhārī replied instantly all the questions as if he was uttering *Qul hu Allāh*.[2] No better acknowledgement of Bukhārī's achievement is forthcoming than Tirmidhī's admission that a large part of what he has written about the transmissional chain, narrators, history, and all the *'ilal* he has indicated, have been derived from Bukhārī's work.

Imam Bukhari's rank in Tradition science

Bukhārī was very careful in respect of his works and loaned them only to the people he could trust. Once a person happened to mention a *Ḥadīth* which gave rise to the suspicion of *tadlīs* upon Bukhārī, that is he had concealed one weak link in the transmissional chain. Bukhārī replied that, in order to obviate such a suspicion, he had relinquished more than ten thousand *Aḥādīth* reported by a particular *muḥaddith*. Therefore, such a suspicion about him was neither justified nor warranted. The author of the *Fatḥ al-Bārī* has narrated a queer incident reflecting Bukhārī's circumspection. During his studentship Bukhārī had to sail in a boat on a river. He had a thousand *ashrafis* (gold coins) in his possession. He was joined by someone who also boarded the boat and met him very reverentially, and gradually developed cordial relations so that Bukhārī happened to mention to him about the money he had with him. One morning[3] the man began to raise hue and cry, saying that his bag containing one thousand *ashrafīs* was missing. The passengers began to be searched, and Bukhārī, appraising the situation, threw the bag into the river. The Imām's belongings were also searched but the money could not be found. Thereupon everyone began to reprimand the accuser who was made to feel contrite. When the journey was over the man asked Bukhārī about the bag of money. Bukhārī replied that he had thrown it away into the river. When the man asked him why he thought it necessary to jettison it into the river and sustain such a big loss, Bukhārī said: "All my life I have spent in collecting and compiling the *Aḥādīth* of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and my integrity has assumed proverbial proportions. How could I afford to lose the far greater wealth which I have acquired against my life's blood by acquiring the taint of a theft?"

---

[1] The *Ḥadīth* in respect of the narrator of which there exists some misgiving is called *ma'lūl*. It is extremely difficult to detect such a *Ḥadīth* and only a very accomplished connoisseur who possesses a very penetrating intellect, sharp memory, and complete mastery over the authorities and text of the Traditions and knows the rank, of the narrators can spot it out. 'Alī bin Madīnī, Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, Imām Bukhārī, Ya'qūb bin Abī Shaybah, Abū Ḥātim, Abū Dhar'ah, Dārquṭnī and many other *muḥaddithīn* have discussed the matter at length.

[2] Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has also described several such incidents. *Qul hu Allāh* are the proverbially cryptic initial words of the Qur'ānic Sura *Ikhlāṣ* (112) meaning "Say: He is Allāh, the One."

[3] This would imply that the journey was lengthwise and not across the river.

As has been mentioned earlier also, Bukhārī was left a great deal of wealth by his father which he invested in trading along with partners so that he might devote himself freely to the task of collecting the *Aḥādīth*. One of his partners once bilked him of the payment of 25,000 *dirhams*. His friends advised him to see the Governor for the restitution of the amount, especially as the latter happened to hold him in such a high regard. Bukhārī said: "If I did that for a worldly purpose, the Governor might sometime desire me to give a *fatwā*[1] on a religious issue, and I am not prepared to barter away my faith for money and Hereafter for this world." He, therefore, did not inform the Governor and instead, requested the debtor to fix some instalment towards repayment. He agreed to pay an instalment of 10 *dirhams* per month. Evidently such a paltry figure was quite inadequate to clear such a huge amount but Bukhārī chose to bear this loss in view of exercising caution in religious matters.

Compilation of the Ahadith: A Brief Survey of its History

It is generally said that the compilation of the *Aḥādīth* commenced in 99 A. H. In a way this is true. We have said "in a way" because the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) had prohibited the taking down of his utterances by saying "لا تكتبوا عنی" "Whatever I say should not be recorded". Why was this so? There are several views about this interdiction. Some scholars of the *Ḥadīth* have said that this was because he wished his *Aḥādīth* to be memorized rather than recorded; if they were recorded, less credibility would be reposed upon memorization. This reason seems to be weakened by the counter-argument put forth by others that, if this principle applied to the *Aḥādīth*, why not to the Qur'ān also, all the more so, since the text of the Qur'ān was copied at the command of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) himself? The argument advanced by many is that this was the period of the descent of the *waḥī* and the *āyahs* were descending upon the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) in succession. The scribes took them down. Therefore, if the *āyāt* and the *Aḥādīth* had been taken down at the same time, they would have got mixed up and it would have become difficult to distinguish between them. Although the Qur'ān is a miracle both in letter and spirit, it descended piecemeal in the midst of a people who were, for the most part, unlettered. They had not till then been introduced to the causes of the miraculous nature of the Qur'ān, its subtleties and profundities, and epoch making significance. Nor were the Arabs of the time fully conversant with the practice and application of the principles enunciated in the Qur'ān. On the other hand, the *Aḥādīth*, although not verbally revealed and not super-human, are, nevertheless, miraculous in their thought content and significance, and represent the sayings of one who is the most eloquent among the eloquents in Arabia, and was vouchsafed a power of speech that is the *ne plus ultra* of rhetoric. This is why the taking down of the *Aḥādīth* was forbidden.

A third school is of the view that, considering the conditions prevalent in Ḥijāz, the number of scribes was minuscule, and, if there had been the slightest lapse in taking them down, the content of the *Aḥādīth* would be changed. Thus, if in the word, *la* (لا), the *alif* is lopped off, the meaning would become the opposite, and the negative would become affirmative. That is why the taking down of the *Aḥādīth* was prohibited by the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) whereas for the Qur'ān, expert scribes and calligraphists were pressed into service and the occurrence of such lapses was totally obviated. But it is also not a fact unknown to the students of Islam that the Arabs of the time of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) enjoyed a kind of memory that can only be called supra-human. The Companions, through constant care and exercise of the fullest attention, transmitted the Tradition to the succeeding generations. There is the famous incident of Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah who was all the time engaged in the memorization of the *Aḥādīth* and was permitted—nay, commanded—by the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) to offer his *witrs* (obligatory night prayers) in the early part of the night.

---

[1] A *fatwā* is the juridical opinion expressed on a point of law by the Muslim jurists.

Transcription of Hadith During Prophet's Life-Time

Although the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) had, as a general rule, asked his Companions to desist from taking down the *Aḥādīth* by saying : "لا تکتبوا عنی" (Do not record anything of mine) nevertheless, it is a proven fact that he graciously allowed some of his Companions to take them down, and, that on occasions, even specifically commanded them to do so. After the conquest of Makkah, the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) delivered a speech before a gathering, during the course of which he gave certain directions to be followed. Thereafter, a Yemenite, by name Abū Shāh, asked: "آکتب لی یا رسول الله" (Please give me in writing, O Prophet of God !). The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم), addressing his Companions, said: "آکتبوا لابی شاه" (Write it down for Abī Shāh) (*Muslim*.)

Ḥaḍrat 'Alī's statement is: "ما عندنا الا ما فی هذه الصحیفة" (The only thing we have is in this book.) This proves that Ḥaḍrat 'Alī had a few *Aḥādīth* written in a book. The *Jāmi' Tirmidhī* has a tradition that Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah (رضی الله عنه) had said: "کان عبدالله ابن عمرو یکتب و لا آکتب" ('Abd Allāh bin 'Amr used to write and not I.) This point has been elaborated in the *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd* (The Chronicles of Ibn Sa'd). Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin 'Amr went to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and sought his esteemed permission to record his *Aḥādīth*. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) very kindly gave his consent. Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin 'Amr further asked: "O Prophet of God, shall I only put down what you say on occasions when you are pleased or also that when you are displeased?" It is possible, he thought, that when the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was displeased, his words were like those of any man and not those of a Prophet. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said unequivocally: "Record both", and pointing to his lips, said : "Nothing contrary to truth comes out of them." Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin 'Amr compiled a collection of the *Aḥādīth* which he entitled *Al-Ṣādiqah* (Truthful Account). Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has mentioned that the name was chosen because during the battle of Yarmūk in the reign of the Caliph 'Umar bin Khaṭṭāb, he was able to secure a few distorted scriptures of the *ahl-i-kitāb* (People of the Book) and may have given this name by way of contrast. This means that according to Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar, the collection bore no title when it was compiled, and this title was chosen long after that, during the reign of the second Pious Caliph, 'Umar. But this hypothesis is apparently incorrect, as the name of the book itself shows that this title must have been chosen at the very time of the compilation.

It has been named so because of the fact that a report is likely to be false or true, but when arguments, indications and testimony definitely establish the veracity of the speaker or narrator, leaving no possibility of falsehood, then the authenticity of the report becomes absolute. That is why all statements proceeding from the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) are absolutely true but this applies only to a person who received such statements through somebody or had heard them directly from the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself. Although the authority which we have at present, right from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) till now, would on this basis be an equivocal report by a single person but since the *Aḥādīth* collected by 'Abd Allāh bin 'Amr in his compilation had been heard directly from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), they are absolutely certain; that is why the compilation was named *Al-Ṣādiqah*. It is that very compilation which according to the *muḥaddithīn*, is known as that "transmitted by 'Amr bin Shu'ayb from his father, from his grandfather."

In sum, it stands proved that the recording of the *Aḥādīth*, nay, the preparation of a regular compilation along with its title, had commenced in the time of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself. Therefore, as regards the prohibition of the Prophet to record anything said by him, we can only say that it applies to the earliest period of Islam when the Arabs were not fully conversant with the Qur'ān and were not cognisant of its miraculous nature, its profound truths and secrets, and not so well capable of distinguishing between the words of God and sayings of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Hence, for fear of confusion between the two, the recording of the *Aḥādīth* was prohibited. But, later on, when these circumstances ceased to exist, he granted permission for the recording of the *Aḥādīth*, and removed the above mentioned restriction. Or it may be said that since people were not generally well versed in calligraphy in those times, had general permission to record been granted, there would have been the danger of change. Still special permission was granted to those exceptional persons who were fully competent in calligraphy and transcription because that would not involve any risk of alteration or mistranscription. Hence Ḥaḍrat Anas and Ḥaḍrat Zayd Bin Thābit too had recorded some *Aḥādīth*, and some were put down later on by Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah also. It is mentioned in the *Muqāddama-i-'Ilmī* that the judgments of Ḥaḍrat 'Alī (رضى الله عنه) written somewhere were brought before Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh Bin 'Abbās (رضى الله عنه). These prove that the Science of the Tradition (recording and compilation) had commenced during the very lifetime of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) although transcription and compilation were not yet generally in vogue as the Arabs of the time were characterized by a strong memory which rendered formal transcription of the *Ḥadīth* unnecessary. Those particular persons who recorded the *Aḥādīth* in this period did not do so as a compilatory effort but at random; nor were the compilations characterized by any order or scientific presentation. The whole work was performed in a haphazard manner.

Compilation of the Hadith and Hadrat 'Umar bin Khattab

The second Pious Caliph, 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb, thought for the first time about the compilation of the *Aḥādīth*. He consulted the Companions and for full one month looked for an *istikhārah* (a significant indication from Heaven.) However, for certain compelling reasons, he decided that the matter should be kept in abeyance for some time. This shows that the idea of a complete book embodying the *Ḥadīth* had already had its gestation during the Second Pious Caliph's time.

'Umar Bin 'Abd al-'Aziz and Compilation of the Hadith

The privilege of compiling a book on the *Aḥādīth* was, however, reserved for the pious Umayyad Caliph, 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz, who was the *mujaddid* (Reformer) of his age during the second century A. H. He felt the urgency for compilation very seriously and in 99 A. H. sent an edict to all the officials of the Caliphate, especially at Madīnah, to cooperate in this sacred venture.

'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (*Raḥmatullāh 'Alayh*) wrote to the officials of the different departments (of the Umayyad Caliphate) to collect all the available *Aḥādīth* of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). (*Fatḥ al-Bārī*)

كَتَبَ عُمَرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيْزِ إِلَى الْآفَاقِ اُنْظُرُوْا
حَدِيْثَ رَسُوْلِ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَاجْمَعُوْهُ.

The First Phase of the Compilation of the *Ḥadīth*

Ḥaḍrat 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (رحمة الله عليه) felt that the exigency of the age demanded a standard collection of the *Aḥādīth* all the more, as the people of Arabia, separated in time from the Prophet's age and its background, were losing, gradually, the memory of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and his Tradition. He, therefore, thought it not only expedient but essential that a standard version of the collected Traditions should be issued, especially as the *Ḥadīth* forms, next to the Qur'ān, the strongest pillar of Muslim faith. The year 99 A. H. would, therefore, be etched on history and the mind of the *millat* for all time to come as a remarkable expository achievement. The Governor of Madīnah, Abū Bakr Bin Ḥazm, commenced the collection. But since the period of 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz's Caliphate was very short, that is from 99 to 101 A. H., the collection could not be presented to him. Other scholars had also started collecting Traditions in compliance with the orders of 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz (رحمة الله عليه). The first book which resulted from these endeavours and reached the people was the one by Abū Shihāb Zuhrī which was written during the reign of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (رحمة الله عليه), with *muḥaddithīn* in other cities following in his footsteps. The stature of these *muḥaddithin* would be evident from their impressive names themselves: Ibn Jurayj at Makkah (died 150 A. H.), Imām Mālik Ibn Anas and Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq, the author of *al-Maghāzī* (wars led by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in Madīnah), Rabī' ibn Ṣabīḥ, Sa'īd ibn Abī 'Arūbah and Ḥammād ibn Salmah at Baṣrah, Sufyān Thawrī at Kūfah; Awzā'ī in Syria, Mu'ammar in Yemen, Layth ibn Sa'd in Egypt, Haytham in Wāsiṭ, Jurayr Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd in Rayy, and 'Abd Allāh ibn Mubārak (died 181 A. H.) in Khurāsān. This would suggest that the science of the Tradition effloresced during the end of the first and the beginning of the second century A. H., and continued down to the end of the second century A. H., as is proved by the date of the death of 'Abd Allāh ibn Mubārak. This represented the first phase of compilation, and only the *al-Muwaṭṭā* of Imām Mālik Ibn Anas is extant out of the many compilations of this period, which is characterized by two kinds of compilations of the Tradition: (i) those that have not taken cognizance of the *isnād* but in which every *ḥadīth*, whether spurious or correct, has been mentioned, and (ii) those that have reproduced the *Aḥādīth* with care, but where the first link in the transmissional chain has not been given due care,[1] nor *ḥujjat* (proof) therefor demands linkage, historical, social and philosophical between the *isnād*. Therefore, the sound (*marfū'*) *Aḥādīth* were mixed with those that did not go to the first authority (*mursal*), those with discontinuous transmissional chain (*munqati'*), the statements by the Companions and even the statements of the *Tābi'īn* (called *maqṭū'*) and jurisprudence, as is evident from the Ṣanī' of Imām Mālik bin Anas. For the first three generations after the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) the extent of duration that had supervened was not too great, and the *mursal* and *marfū' Aḥādīth* were not segregated. This was the rationale of the three great Imāms of Islamic jurisprudence, Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, Abū Ḥanīfah and Mālik Bin Anas. For this very reason it was not considered necessary to treat the *mursal* and the *marfū' Aḥādīth* separately. Another reason for the absence of critical appraisal was the benefit which, it was thought, was to accrue from the *Aḥādīth*, whether *mursal*, *marfū'* or *marfū'*. It was, however, the founder of the fourth Muslim school of jurisprudence, Imām Shāfi'ī, who submitted the *mursal Aḥādīth* to close examination; no one before him had questioned the veracity of such *Aḥādīth*. Ibn Jarīr Ṭabarī has described that there was a consensus on this issue before the Imām's time, but Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has not upheld this view. He has mentioned names of two or three *muḥaddithīn* for whom a general consensus on this issue is doubtful. But, all the same, the mention of two or three names only shows that there was a general agreement between the *ulamā* and the community on this issue. In the event, it was Imām Shāfi'ī who first questioned the authenticity of *mursal Aḥādīth* and has discussed this point in *Al-Risālah*, printed in the initial part of the *Kitāb al-Um*. This was a very important step forward in the Science of the Tradition and was taken up by succeeding *muḥaddithīn*. The *muḥaddithīn* in general began to feel the necessity of subjecting the *mursal Aḥādīth* to the crucible of examination and the occurrence of *marfū'* and *mursal Aḥādīth* began to rankle in their scrutinizing eyes, as in the *Al-Muwaṭṭa* of Imām Mālik bin Anas.

The Second Phase in the Compilation of the Tradition.

Imām Shāfi'ī's new approach heralded what can be called the second era in the collection of the Traditions. It was felt that the *marfū'* and *mursal Aḥādīth* should be distinguished from each other; so from the third century A. H. onwards a new era in compilation crystallized. The *Aḥādīth* collected during these times began to be differentiated. Such compilations, called the *Musnads*, are based upon the authority of the Companions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Several *Musnads* were compiled during this period by leading *muḥaddithīn* in the major cities, e.g., those of 'Ubayd Allāh bin Mūsā in Kūfah, Musaddad bin Masrahad in Baṣrah and Ya'qūb bin Shaybah Mālikī in Egypt. The last named undertook such an extensive compilation that, were it to reach completion, it would run into 200 volumes. Similarly, Ḥāfiẓ Ḥasan bin Aḥmad bin Muḥammad of Samarqand wrote his *Musnad*, which, on the authority of *al-Dhahbī*, incorporated 120,000

---

[1] The *Aḥādīth* from the Companions who heard them from the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallaho 'alaihi wa sallam*) are called *marfū'*. The *Aḥādīth* in which the first Companion who heard it from the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallaho 'alaihi wa sallam*) has not been mentioned by a *Tābi'ī* is called *mursal*. A *ḥadīth* with broken or discontinuous transmissional chain is *munqaṭi'*.

Aḥādīth. The *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal is a selection of one hundred and forty thousand *Aḥādīth* out of a total of 1,750,000. He himself said about it: "Whichever *ḥadīth* is not to be found in the *Musnad* is not a *ḥadīth* at all." Some *muḥaddithīn* criticised this statement, but what the Imām meant was that all the *Aḥādīth* which had been transmitted to his age had been incorporated in it. Of the four Imāms, Shāfi'ī and Abū Ḥanīfah have also *Musnads* credited to their names, but they were probably written by others. The *Musnad* of Aḥmad is also not wholly written in Imām Ḥanbal's hand; he only prepared the draft which was faired out by his son, 'Abd Allāh bin Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal. In the event, of the different *Musnads*, only that of Imām Ḥanbal enjoyed wide circulation. Others have been mentioned only in historical treatises. While the *marfū'* and non-*marfū' Aḥādīth* were separated from each other in this age, what still perplexed the *muḥaddithīn* was the presence of the unsound *Aḥādīth* side by side with the sound ones. In the *Musnad* of Imām Ḥanbal, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* (sound), *ḥasan* (fair), and *ḍa'īf* (unsound) *Aḥādīth* occur indiscriminately alongside one another. No work which separates these kinds of *Aḥādīth* is to be found in the second era of the compilation of the Traditions, one which could be followed safely, and it became necessary that the *marfū' Aḥādīth* should be collected. Here, too, deduction and induction should be the guiding factors and only those *marfū'* Traditions that admit of unquestionable veracity, should be included.

The Third Phase in the Compilation of the Tradition

The third century A. H. witnessed development of the Science of the Tradition along these lines. Its first exponent is Bukhārī from whose hands appeared a book that would last for ever. Later on, Muslim followed this up and wrote the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. The general opinion of scholars and the *ummah* about these books is that they are the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, that is, the two authentic compilations of Traditions. Other compilations also came forth based on the five principles illustrated above. One question that might be asked at this stage could be: if the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* also embodies the Traditions that are *mursal*, and on the authority of the *Tābi'īn*, then what is the difference between the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and the works of the first era? The answer to this would be that Bukhārī has not mixed up the *marfū'* and non-*marfū'* as in the *Muwaṭṭā* but included the latter type of *Aḥādīth* incidentally in the captions of the various chapters. But if once or twice he has done so, it has been done as a matter of form and not deliberately. Imām Muslim has been even more careful in this regard. He has scrupulously avoided non-*marfū' Aḥādīth*, so much so that he has not even fixed any title and tabulated *marfū' Aḥādīth* by keeping some heading in view. Thus, both *Bukhārī* and *Muslim* have rendered a signal service to the Science of the Tradition. In the *Tafhīm al-Ilāhīyah*, Shāh Walī Allāh writes:

> In my view, the most deserving of the title of the *mujaddid* (Renovator of religion) are Imām Bukhārī and Imām Muslim.

Incentive to Compile the *Ṣaḥīḥ*

Bukhārī was led to the writing of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* by one of his teachers, Isḥāq bin Rahwayh, who, while addressing the whole class of his pupils, said : "لو جمعتم مختصرا يصحح سنة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم" "Would that one of you prepare a concise and sound collection of Prophet's Sunnah".

This proved to be an incentive to Bukhārī to collect the authentic *Aḥādīth* of the Prophet and he became fully conscious of the need to undertake such a compilation. He also had dreams which hinted at the necessity of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. In one of his dreams, Bukhārī saw himself driving off flies from the sacred countenance of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) with a whisk—which on interpretation meant that specious and fabricated *Aḥādīth* had collected like flies round the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and had to be driven off ; a collection relinquishing these spurious *Aḥādīth* should be undertaken. *Al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ* is the *magnum opus* of Bukhārī and he has been conferred the honorific title of "Amīr al-Muminīn fi al-Ḥadīth", that is, "Commander of the Faithful in *Ḥadīth*" because of it.

A Brief Survey of the Book

Bukhārī compiled the book by reproducing a selection of the *Aḥādīth* out of the six hundred thousand which he remembered. Every *ḥadīth* he has reproduced bespeaks his utmost vigilance, care, and scrupulousness. His procedure was to examine every *ḥadīth* as to its soundness, to take a bath, and to offer two *rak'āt* of prayer for divine monition before he could decide if the *ḥadīth* should be entered into the *Ṣāḥīḥ Bukhārī*. In all, the book took sixteen years to complete. Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan (رحمة الله عليه) says that Bukhārī fasted all along when writing the book and kept the fast in such a way that even his household members did not know about it. The food sent to him from home was distributed among the indigent. Sulaymān bin Dā'ūd Harawī has quoted an authority, close to Bukhārī, as having said that he compiled the work in Makkah, and committed to writing the headings of the chapters in between the pulpit of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and his mausoleum. This statement probably means that he commenced the compilation at Makkah, as it is obvious that he did not stay in Makkah for sixteen years, or that he finally prepared the draft at Makkah, and then, on reaching Madīnah, faired out the captions and collected the *Aḥādīth*. Those who read the book directly from Bukhārī numbered ninety thousand and his own *shaykhs* came to one thousand and eighty. Bukhārī has been very liberal in this regard and has taken recourse to every aspect of science of the Tradition and other fields of knowledge. Wakī' has said: "لا يصير الرجل عالما حتى ياخذ عمن هو فوقه وعمن هو دونه وعمن هو مثله" "No one can become a scholar till he learns from those above him, less than him, and equal to him." A like statement is attributed to Bukhārī also and he acted accordingly ; he has even taken a few narrations from his pupil, Tirmidhī. The latter took great pride in this and mentioned it in his book on several occasions. Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has referred to the dream of Abū Zayd Marwazī: "I was asleep between *Rukn*[1] and *Maqām*[2]. I saw the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) appear and heard him say : 'O Abū Zayd, how long wilt thou go on teaching Shāfi'ī's book and not mine?' I asked : 'which book is that, my Lord ?' The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said : 'Jāmi' Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī.' "

Works by Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari

The *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is, undoubtedly, Imām Bukhārī's *magnum opus*. But in addition to this major work he has authored some 23 significant works which are as follows :—

---

[1] The Black Stone at Makkah called *Rukn-i-Yamānī*.

[2] The place where the Prophet Ibrāhīm (*'Alayhi al-salām*) prayed.

1. *Qaḍāyā al-Ṣaḥābah wa al-Tābi'īn* (Judgments by the Companions and their Successors). Bukhārī is on record as having said that he was only eighteen years old when he wrote this book. This was in the year 212 A.H.

2. *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (Major Chronicle). This work succeeded the first when Bukhārī was of the same age. It was written between the Ḥajar al-Sa'ādat and the pulpit of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) about which place the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said: "مابین بیتی و منبری روضة من ریاض الجنة" (The place between my house and the pulpit is a garden out of the gardens of Paradise.) Bukhārī used to say about this work that all the names mentioned therein were fully embossed on his memory and with each name he could associate the specific incidents or circumstances, but he did not dilate upon them, in which case the book would have become a compendium, and not a book.

   When Bukhārī's teacher, Isḥāq bin Rahwayh, saw the book, he called on Amīr 'Abd Allāh bin Ṭāhir Khurāsānī and said: "ایها الامیر الا اریک سحرا" (O Amir, shall I not show you a magical work?) Amīr 'Abd Allāh expressed great surprise over the work.

   In this work, Bukhārī has arranged the entries in alphabetical order with regard to the Companions, the generation next to that of the Companions (*tābi'īn*) and the third generation (*tāba' tābi'īn*) as well as the narrators of the Traditions. If members of this transmissional chain, bearing the same names, have had to be described, the alphabetical precedence is according to their patronyms. Where the patronym is not traceable, Bukhārī has put down the *ḥadīth* at the end, under a heading which means "from the common talk of people". In some parts the *Aḥādīth* have been critically examined. He completed this book near the mausoleum of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) without the aid of a lamp, in the moonlight. Dāi'rat al-Ma'ārif, Hyderabad (India) has published this book in parts.

3. *Al-Adab al-Mufrad* (Unique Morality). This is a unique work on the ethical content of the Holy Prophet's life, ascribed to Bukhārī by Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin Jalīl al-Bazāz. It has been translated into Persian by Nawāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān and published at Agra. Its Urdu translation has been published from different places.

4. *Al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr* (The Major Exegesis). Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar in the *Bāb Sīratihī wa Manāqibihī* (The Chapter on *Sīrat and Virtues*) has quoted on Warraq's authority that the latter saw Bukhārī inditing the book, and he (Bukhārī) appeared to be tired.

5. *Al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* (History of the Middle Period). This work has been attributed to Bukhārī by 'Abd Allāh bin Aḥmad bin 'Abd al-Salam al-Khaffāf and Abū Muḥammad Zanjūyah bin Muḥammad al-'Ibād.

6. *Al-Jāmi' al-Kabīr* (The Major Collection). This is also a work of Bukhārī on the Science of the Tradition. Ḥāfiz ibn Kathīr copied the whole book himself.

7. *Asāmī al-Ṣaḥābah* (Names of the Companions). The first book on this crucial subject has come from the pen of Bukhārī, after whom 'Allāmah ibn 'Abd al-Birr, Ḥāfiz ibn Ḥajar and others have written on the subject. In his *Mu'jim al-Ṣaḥābah* (Alphabetical Encyclopaedia of the Companions), Abū al-Qāsim Bughwī has copied some portions from this book also.

8. *Kitāb al-Mabsūṭ* (The Encyclopaedia). This book has been attributed to Bukhārī by Fahīb bin Salīm.

9. *Al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaghīr fi al-Ḥadīth* (A Short Collection of the *Aḥādīth*). This has been attributed by 'Abd Allāh bin Muḥammad al-Ashqar to Bukhārī. Ḥāfiz ibn Ḥajar has included it among the extant works of Bukhārī and copied it.[1]

10. *Birr al-Wālidain* (The Piety of Parents). Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar claims this to be one of the books by Bukhārī, but its MS has not been traced so far.

11. *Kitāb al-Kunī* (The Book of Patronyms). Muslim and Nisāī have also written on this subject after Bukhārī under the same title. Ḥakīm Abū Aḥmad copied material for his books from this work. Shaykh Shams al-Dīn Dhahbī says that the most detailed work on the subject is by Nisāī after whom Ḥākim, benefiting from his work, brought the work to fourteen volumes. Dhahbī holds this work to be very important, but what prevents posterity to benefit from this work is the fact that the entries were not alphabetically arranged. Dhahbī says that he abridged the work and rearranged it in alphabetical order, calling the book, *Al-Muqtanī fi Sard al-Kunī'* (Possessed by Eloquence in the Selection and Narration of Patronyms).

12. *Kitāb al-Riqāq*. This book has been ascribed to Bukhārī by the author of the *Kashf al-Ẓanūn* and what has been said about it amounts only to this : “كتاب الرقاق للبخارى من كتب الاحاديث” (The *Kitāb al-Riqāq* is by Bukhārī and is a book on the *Ḥadīth*.)

13. *Al-Tārīkh al-Ṣughīr* (A Short History). This book has been arranged chronologically, and having given the names of the scholars who died in a particular year, proceeds to discuss the succeeding ones. This work has been attributed to Bukhārī by 'Abd Allāh bin 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ashqar. *Al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr* has since been published at Allahabad.

14. *Al-Musnad al-Kabīr* (The Great Collection of *Aḥādīth*). In the *Kashf al-Ẓanūn* reference has been made to this work on the authority of Nuwayrī. Farbarī has also mentioned this work. Ibn Mulqan in his *Sharḥ Tawḍīḥ* has quoted Abū S'ad Ismā'īl bin Abī al-Qāsim al-Būshanjī for the statement of Bukhārī to

---

[1] From the notes on *Sīrat al-Bukhārī* (The Life of Bukhārī) it seems that the intact MS of *Al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* and the MS written by Ḥāfiz ibn Ḥajar of *Al-Jāmi' al-Kabīr* along with the *Asāmī al-Ṣaḥabah* and the *Jāmi' al-Ṣaghīr* were in the library of the University of Berlin before World War II.

the effect that he had written a work embodying one hundred thousand *Aḥādīth*, but neither has described the name of the book. It is quite possible that they might have expressed their opinion about it.

15. *Kitāb al-Waḥdān*. Books on the same subject and bearing identical titles have been written by Bukhārī, Muslim, and Nisāī, but Bukhārī's book enjoys chronological precedence wherein he has described the Companions who have been credited with *Ḥadīth* only. *Al-Waḥdān* of Imām Muslim and Nisāī has been published from Agra.
16. *Kitāb al-Ashribah*. This work has been described by Dār Quṭnī in *al-Mu'talif wa al-Mukhtalif*.
17. *Khalqu Af'āl al-'Ibād* (The Genesis of the Acts of Man). After his controversy with Imām Dhuhlī on the question of the Qur'ān being created or not, he took up writing on the subject and rebutted false beliefs in the manner of *muḥaddithīn*. The book has been printed.
18. *Kitāb al-Fawāi'd* (The Book of Benefits). Tirmidhī has mentioned it in the *Kitāb al-Manāqib*.
19. *Kitāb al-Hibāh* (The Book of Endowments). Ibn al-Mubārak and Wakī' ibn Jarāh have written books by this name too, but Wakī' has incorporated only two and Ibn al-Mubārak only five authentic *Aḥādīth*. The scribe employed by Bukhārī, Muḥammad bin Abī Ḥātim, has mentioned this book by Bukhārī which contains about 500 *Aḥādīth*.
20. *Juzu' al-Qir'āt Khalf al-Imām* (Recitation of the Qur'ān behind the Imām by the Congregation), wherein Bukhārī discusses the subject of the recitation of the Qur'ān in the light of Tradition and *Sunnah*. This treatise has been printed in Egypt.
21. *Rafa' al-Yadain* (Raising of Both Hands). This book has been ascribed to Bukhārī by his pupil, Maḥmūd bin Isḥāq al-Khāzā'ī.
22. *Kitāb al-Ḍu'afā al-Ṣaghīr* (Book of the Unauthentic Narrators). Ādam bin Mūsā Jufāri, Abū J'afar bin Sa'īd, and Abū al-Bashar Muḥammad bin Aḥmad Dūlabī (رحمهم الله). have mentioned this work as that of Bukhārī. The unauthentic *Aḥādīth* have been given in alphabetical order. The book has been printed by Dār al-Ma'ārif, Azamgarh.
23. *Kitāb al-'Ilal*. This book serves as an introduction to the innate gift of inductive capability and the unique individuality of approach in respect of the circumstances pertaining to the Tradition. The transmissional chain up to Bukhārī is as follows :—

    > Ibn Mandah on the authority of Muḥammad bin 'Abd Allāh bin Ḥamdūn on the authority of Abī Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh bin Al-Sharafī on the authority of Imām Bukhārī.

The Juridical School Followed by Bukhari

Tāj al-Dīn Sibkī in his Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'īyah (Chronicles of the Shāfi'ī Madhhab) has counted Bukhārī as a Shafiite, but this assumption is based on the fact that books by Bukhārī such as Rafa' *Yadain* and Qirā't Khalf al-Imām conform to Shāfi'ī's views. Shafiite scholars like Karābīsī, Abū Thawr, and Z'afrānī recited many a *Ḥadīth* to Bukhārī and he had benefited in jurisprudence from Ḥamīdī, all pupils of Imām Shafi'ī. For this reason Bukhārī has been called a Shafiite. On the other hand, we have Bukhārī's statement that he called on Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal eight times and Abū Al-Ḥasan ibn Al-'Irāqī, because of this, claims him to be a Ḥanbalite. We have already stated that Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal was grieved at the departure of Bukhārī from Baghdād, and was rather hesitant in letting him go. We can, however, claim that his approach is compounded of a leaven derived from both. As a pupil of Isḥāq bin Rahwayh, he can be regarded as a Ḥanafite too. Then, on many a problem, he has supported Imām Abū Ḥanīfah against Imām Shāfi'ī. He has, thus, recorded differences with both the Ḥanafite and Shafiite schools, and, like an independent-minded person who does not leave premises unquestioned, he was not bound by a single *madhhab* but had his own interpretive approach.

Imam Bukhari And Imam Abu Hanifah

In the Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥiḥ, Bukhārī has criticised Imām Abū Ḥanifah at different places, particularly In the *Kitāb al-Ḥiyal* (The Book of Stratagems) and the *Kitāb al-Ikrāh* (The Book of Indictment). It is likewise true that there was some intellectual disputation between the famous Ḥanafite of his time, Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr and Bukhārī, but it would be questioning Bukhārī's intellectual integrity to hold it to be at the heart of these criticisms. What probably is nearer the truth is that Bukhārī has criticised the Ḥanafite approach as it reached him on the basis of nothing but what he thought was the best. For us, both the Imāms are worthy of respect. To respect one and to adversely criticise the other has been the approach of a mental deviate, and an objective scholar should avoid this scrupulously. Each Imām has his own detractors and these distractive remarks occur in the works arrayed against them. Imām Mālik was severely criticised by Ibn Abī Dha'b. Imām Shāfi'ī was argued against by Yaḥyā bin Mū'īn and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah by Sūfyān Thawrī. Tāj al-Dīn Sibkī writes in his book: "There is hardly any Imām who has not been criticised". If, on the basis of the strictures, we turn away from the Imām, then from whom shall we learn the religion of Islam?

Such Imāms as are universally admired and respected do not lose anything if the spears of animus and deliberate distractions are directed at them; their greatness remains unshaken. Nevertheless, we might say that each Imām would be regarded great in his own field. If an Imām has achieved the status of a pontiff in his own field, he would not enjoy an equivalent status in other fields. To take the case of Imām Ghazālī, he is a master without peer in scholasticism, jurisprudence, *tasawwuf* (Muslim mysticism), and in esoterism, but he does not enjoy the same degree of undisputed authority with regard to the *Ḥadīth*. Thus, in Ihyā al-'Ulūm (The Revival of Knowledge), Ghazālī has quoted *Aḥādīth* which the later exegesists claimed as not having undisputed authority, and, therefore, as a *muḥaddith*, he does not enjoy the same rank. Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī (Mujaddid Alf Thānī) has particularly directed to keep in view their respective positions. A disciple once cited an authority to show that a well-known scholar had acted in a particular manner on a certain occasion. Shaykh Aḥmad replied in writing: "درین جا جنید و شبلی بکار نیند-درین جا محمد بن الحسن شیبانی و محمد بن ادریس شافعی می باید" (In this matter Junayd and Shiblī are out of place. Here we should place (reliance) upon Muḥammad bin Al-Ḥasan Shaybānī and Muḥammad bin Idrīs Shāfi'ī.)

On this analogy we accord the rank of Imām to Bukhārī in the Science of the Tradition and to Abū Ḥanīfah in Muslim jurisprudence. It is a characteristic of Shāh Walī Allāh's school that it eschews the antagonistic approach, and believes that each Imām has his own speciality and a rank in his own field, and we consider the soundness of the statement with respect to his specific discipline. Nevertheless, we accord respect to all of them.

The Piety of Bukhari

It has been mentioned earlier that Bukhārī's father had left him considerable wealth but he spent most of it for the sacred purpose of acquiring knowledge. Sometimes during his journeys, he was so overcome by starvation that he had to resort to eating raw vegetation. There is one incident that would broadly indicate Bukhārī's staunch austerity, soundness of intention, and truthfulness. He was presented with some gifts. A trader called on him and offered 5,000 *dirhams* for them. Bukhārī said he would ponder over the matter and let him know the next day, but he had already decided to dispose of the goods for that amount. In the meantime, another merchant called on him and doubled the bid. It is obvious that according to no juristic criterion was Bukhārī committed to the transaction since he had not, verbally or in writing, bound himself to the first merchant, but he, nevertheless, told the second merchant that, although no contract had been entered into, he had already decided in his heart to accept the first merchant's offer and could not, therefore, entertain the second higher bid.

A Subtle Point

Actions of a sort arise merely by one's intending them, although, until and unless they are performed, juristic principles do not apply to them. God being Omniscient and cognisant of all things, ever so hidden, even these impalpable acts have an entity. An embryo lying hidden in the mother's womb will not be governed by human laws, though it is all the same a living being. On this subtle reasoning, Bukhārī saved himself from being a liar in the eyes of God, although his intention was not known to the people. No doubt, God had graced him with a remarkable insight into piety.

The Ḥanbalite Shaykh, Ibn 'Aqīl, in the *Badāi' al-Fawāi'd* (The Rare Benefits), says that the acceptance of gift by someone in a state of euphoria, excessive joy, pensiveness, or excessive grief should not be accepted by the pious, since the giver is not in a balanced state of mind, and later on he may repent of having lavished a gift that he would not have done in a normal state. But, on the other hand, from the legal viewpoint the acceptance of such a gift is permitted. This should bring out the distinction between the legal and the pious approaches towards life. Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār, the famous Persian mystic poet, has quoted the example of an ascetic who had had no food for days together and could not, therefore, mask the effects of starvation. One of his disciples guessed the situation and left the assembly to bring food for him. And when presented, the divine politely refused it. The disciple said, "Sir, the food is clean; it has not been tainted with ill-acquired money or obtained through doubtful means." The divine said in reply, "This, my son, is not the reason for my inability to accept the food. The fact is that the moment you left the assembly, I was conscious that you would bring the food and had a curiosity to peep (*ishrāf*) into it. Has it not been said in the *Ḥadīth* that what has been obtained through *ishrāf* is not blessed? I cannot, therefore, accept the food." The disciple was possessed of a very sharp mind. He collected the food, went a little distance, and brought it back saying: "The *ishrāf* has been cancelled. Please do accept the food now." The divine was very highly pleased with the presence of mind possessed by his disciple and accepted the food. The company of the pious is a great blessing and one gets faith, steadfastness, piety and continence from such company. The discipleship of the pious has been enjoined thus:

O you that are of faith! Fear God
and be in the company of the truthful.
(Qur'ān, 9:119)

يٰٓاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللّٰهَ وَكُوْنُوْا
مَعَ الصّٰدِقِيْنَ۔ (توبہ، آیت ۱۱۹)

Bukhārī was offering prayers when a wasp made an entry into his clothes and stung him at eleven places. Bukhārī continued with his prayers and only after having completed the full complement of the *rak'āt*, asked his servant to see what had stung him. Then, on an examination of his shirt, it was found that he had been stung at eleven places. A similar occurrence has been described about Imām Mālik bin Anas, who was teaching the *Ḥadīth*. A scorpion having entered his shirt had stung him. The Imām did not care about it and completed the lecture as usual with all the due respect and regard. With each sting by the scorpion, the Imām's facial expression underwent a change; nevertheless, he bore the stings. At the end of the lecture he asked one of the pupils to look inside the shirt; seventeen stings were discovered. The students asked him as to why he had borne all this harassment. The Imām's reply was that he thought it to be against decorum to look elsewhere during the *Ḥadīth* course. This was, in fact Mālik's reflection of the respect he accorded to the *Ḥadīth*. He always had a bath before undertaking lectures on the *Aḥadīth*, sprayed his clothes with scent, and took his seat with utmost devotion and attention before his pupils.

Similarity between Imam Bukhari and Imam Malik

Abū Maṣ'ab has claimed that Bukhārī enjoys a rank higher than Imām Ibn Ḥanbal in jurisprudence. One of his pupils, when he heard this statement, could not but express his amazement. Abū Maṣ'ab's rejoinder to this was: "Why do you express surprise over this? I should go rather further and say that, if you compare Bukhārī and Mālik, you would find them bearing considerable resemblance." The Abbasid Caliph, Hārūn al-Rashīd, held Mālik in high esteem and presented himself before him along with his sons, Amīn and Mamūn, and requested him to read passages from *Al-Muwaṭṭā*. Mālik's way of teaching did not agree with the method that the teacher should read out and students should listen; he followed the opposite course, although at times he, as an exception, did recite himself also. Thus, he recited 500 ***Aḥadīth*** before Imām Muḥammad bin al-Ḥasan, companion of Abī Ḥanīfah: this was the peculiarity of Imām Muḥammad's way of teaching. Mālik refused to accede to the Caliph's request and said: "You should read and I shall listen." The Caliph read as desired by Mālik. The latter also rejected the Caliph's request that impartation of the knowledge of the *Ḥadīth* should exclude others, as in theological teaching, if the commonalty is excluded, the elite will not also gain much. Mālik accorded such a high degree of respect to the *Ḥadīth* that he did not even care for the Caliph.

A similar incident befell Bukhārī, when he was returning, after a long journey, to Bukhārā. When the people of Bukhārā learned of his coming, they made arrangements to accord him a befitting welcome. Arcades and festoons over long distances were set up. When people surged forth by thousands to welcome him, the Governor of Bukhārā, Khālid bin Muḥammad Dhuhlī, himself bade the Imām welcome back home, and comported himself very courteously in his presence. Students gathered round Bukhārī when he began to lecture on the Traditions in the mosque. The Governor requested Bukhārī to teach his sons the science of the Traditions in the gubernatorial residence. Bukhārī refused outright, saying that if his sons wanted to learn the Tradition, they should do so in the mosque. The Governor agreed, but then stipulated that his sons should be taught separately. Bukhārī turned down this suggestion also and said that insofar as the teaching of the *Ḥadīth* is concerned, there is no distinction observable between the high and the low. This infuriated the Governor and he began to harass Bukhārī. When the cup of patience overflowed, Bukhārī cursed him. The curse was so effective that within a month the Governor's face was blackened and, mounted on a donkey, he was made to ride round the city.

Acceptance of Prayer

Historians have claimed that only twice did Bukhārī pray and at both times his prayers were immediately graced by Divine Acceptance. He never again prayed for any special purpose and said that such acceptance of prayer is tantamount to deriving gains from one's virtuous deeds and he did not like such gains.

Three scholars in the tradition of Shāh Walī Allāh are outstanding: Shāh 'Abd Al-'Azīz, Mawlānā Muḥammad Ya'qūb and Mawlānā Sayyid Anwar Shāh. Mawlānā Muḥammad Ya'qūb was the first head teacher at the Dār al-'Ulūm and was the Shaykh al-Ḥadīth (Head of the Department of Tradition). He possessed considerable command over the disciplines current in his time, so much so that he was an expert even in music. He was a visionary in outlook and, during the course of his lectures, often used to describe his own intuitive experience. He said he had prayed to God Almighty not to vouchsafe pre-visions to him, since whatever would be made apparent to him, he would disclose to others. He said: "I am not one to bless anyone but I can harm some people by cursing." That is to say, his curse would have its effect by being accepted and he, therefore, scrupulously avoided it.

Bukhari's Poetry

The pillar on which Bukhārī's greatness rests is in the field of the science of the Tradition. Many tributes paid to him by the succeeding generations of *Muḥaddithīn* would be impossible to reproduce here. Suffice it to say that he is held to be the last word in theological disquisitions and disputations ; he has been conferred the title of the Sayyid al-Fiqh and the most scholarly of *Muḥaddithīn* have acclaimed him as their mentor. What greater tribute could have been possible for him than that he should have been asked by his own teachers to correct their works ? With the trail of all this behind him, he has also composed extempore verses. His prose writing is characterized by total command over the language ; nonetheless his verses also deserve consideration, and some of them have been quoted by Abū 'Abd Allāh Al-Ḥākim in his History :

اِغْتَنِمْ فِی الْفَرَاغِ فَضْلَ رُكُوْعٍ   فَعَسٰى اَنْ يَّكُوْنَ مَوْتُكَ بَغْتَةً

When you are free ponder over the blessings poured upon you
by prayers, for it is but possible that you may die any moment.

كَمْ صَحِيْحٍ رَاَيْتُ مِنْ غَيْرِ سَقَمٍ   ذَهَبَتْ نَفْسُهُ الصَّحِيْحَةُ فَلْتَةً

I saw many people who enjoyed enviable health and
puissance in life suddenly pounced upon by death.

Tāj al-Dīn Sibki has copied in his famous Ṭabaqāt-i-Kubrā (The Chronicles of the Great) the following two verses by Bukhārī :

مِثْلُ الْبَهَائِمِ لَا تَرٰى اٰجَالَهَا   حَتّٰى تُسَاقَ اِلَى الْمَجَازِرِ وَتُنْحَرُ

The purposeless ones are like cattle, unaware of their Hereafter; they are at last taken to the abattoir and slaughtered.

خَالِقِ النَّاسَ بِخُلُقٍ وَاسِعٍ   لَا تَكُنْ كَلْبًا عَلَى النَّاسِ تَهِرُّ

Comport yourself towards others politely and affably,
and be not like a dog that barks all the time.

The learned are more sensitive than the others towards their fellow-scholars' lives, and, when one such scholar dies, their life becomes a pall of gloom. This sensitivity declines in a society where wealth takes the place of scholarship and, in general, it is insensitive towards such happenings. When Ḥāfiẓ 'Abd al-Raḥmān died, Bukhārī came out spontaneously with the couplet :

اِنْ عِشْتَ تُفْجَعُ بِالْاَحِبَّةِ كُلِّهِمْ   وَبَقَاءُ نَفْسِكَ لَا اَبَا لَكَ اَفْجَعُ

If you outlive them, you will have to sustain the sorrow of the death
of all your friends ; your life, therefore, will be a sorrowful thing.

The poetry of Bukhārī is, by and large, admonitory. The verses quoted above indicate the taste of Bukhārī. His verses often have death as the axis of thought and the Hereafter also always, directly or indirectly, ebbs out of his poetry.

Bukhari's Life at Nishapur

Because of his renown, a great man has many enemies who are jealous of his attainment, as they are consumed by a feeling of inferiority. Even the great ones are not immune from it. When Imām al-Ḥaramayn, the teacher of Ghazālī, felt that his pupil's reputation was outstripping his own, he became envious and tried to traduce Ghazālī but his efforts bore no success. Ghazālī's greatness soared upwards and upwards, remained untarnished and reached the heights for which he was destined.

A similar incident occurred also in the life of Bukhārī. In 250 A.H. he went to Nishāpūr, where a rousing welcome was given to him by all and sundry. He was welcomed in person by Imām Dhuhlī who was the most prominent scholar of the city at the time. When Bukhārī arranged a lecture on the Science of the Tradition, the whole city flocked to listen to him. He had gained so much in fame that even Imām Muslim of Nishāpūr who enjoyed the status of an *Imām* in the field, became his pupil and a very devoted and affectionate one at that. Ḥāfiz ibn Ḥajar, in the *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, has mentioned an incident which is as follows: Muslim regarded the *ḥadīth* on "group atonement" in his book (the *Ṣaḥīḥ*) as unimpeachable and considered his own induction about it as absolutely correct. He presented this authority before Bukhārī and asked: "Is there a more reliable authority on it?" Bukhārī replied: "It is good but *ma'lūl*." A *ma'lūl ḥadīth* is one that contains a hidden defect ascertainable by scholars of the Tradition alone. Muslim was rather surprised and asked about the *'illat* (flaw) present in it. Bukhārī pointed it out and Muslim was amazed at Bukhārī's depth of knowledge, and spontaneously kissed his forehead and hand, said: "وعنى آقبل رجليک" "Please permit me to kiss your feet."

From that time onwards Muslim began to address Bukhārī as *ustādh al-ustādh* (master of masters), *yā Sayyid al-Muḥaddithīn* (O Chief of the *Muḥaddithīn*!) and *Ṭabīb al-Ḥadīth fi 'ilalihī* (The Remedier of Traditions in their discrepancies). This is the same Muslim who earlier, while discussing a controversial point in the prolegomena of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* with regard to the principles of Tradition, had passed stringent remarks on Bukhārī and later came to acknowledge him as his master and began to hold him in such high esteem. This is but the way of the noble people. Whatever the lapse or the excess committed, it should be dispelled in this world, and nothing should be answered for in the Hereafter. When such persons reach Paradise, the following words of the Qur'ān would apply to them:

وَنَزَعْنَا مَا فِي صُدُورِهِمْ مِنْ غِلٍّ إِخْوَانًا عَلَىٰ سُرُرٍ مُتَقَابِلِينَ

And We remove whatever rancour may be in their breasts. As brethren, face to face, (they rest) on couches raised. (Qur'ān 15:47)

Muḥammad bin Abī Bakr, the son of the first Pious Caliph, underwent a similar experience. He led a group of rebels from Egypt against the third Pious Caliph, Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān bin 'Affān. He besieged the Caliph's house, forcibly entered it, and caught hold of the beard of that noble Caliph. But the preliminaries of his punishment in this world were provided in the battle of the Jamal. When an arrow hit the leg of the camel on which Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah was mounted, it began to waver and was about to fall down. The litter of Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah loosened, and Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, lest the litter fall to the ground, propped it with his hands, but his hands touched the sacred body of the Umm al-Muminīn who thought that it was an enemy's hand. She spontaneously came out with a curse: "May the hand that extended towards the ḥaram-i-Nabawī (Prophet's wife) burn out!" Muḥammad bin Abī Bakr said: "I am your brother Muḥammad." Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah said: "Whatever I have said shall happen." And during the Umayyad regime Muḥammad bin Abī Bakr was flayed, his skin was stuffed with straw, and set afire. Thus was the punishment for the crime which he had committed against one of the noblest of human beings, 'Uthmān bin 'Affān, awarded on earth. On the same analogy Muslim atoned for his strictures against Bukhārī by means of the affection and regard he developed for him.

There is still another incident that points to Muslim's affection and regard for Bukhārī. When Bukhārī was coming to Nishāpūr, Muḥammad bin Yahyā Dhuhlī had asked people to abstain from putting questions on an academic matter. But man becomes more and more avid for what is forbidden, Hence a person from amongst those who had come to attend his lectures on the Tradition asked him about the Qur'ān being created or not. Thinking that the answer he would give would not be easily understood by the people in general, Bukhārī at first tried to avoid replying the question. That person again came forward with the same question. Bukhārī then replied : "آلفاظنا آفعالنا وآفعالنا ،مخلوقة" "Our words are our acts and our acts are the created ones."

This sentence is obviously in consonance with the Sunnite creed but the community of the people, as Bukhārī had rightly guessed, fell a prey to misunderstanding and stirred up great mischief against him. Seeking the refuge of the words employed by Bukhārī, some jealous of him began to propagate that he regarded the Qur'ān as created (*ḥādith*) which necessitates contingency (*ḥudūth*), a credo of the Mu'tazilites. This propaganda intensified the misunderstanding against him, despite his having categorically stated that anyone who attributes this belief to him is a patent liar, a traducer, and slanderer.

Bukhārī's increassing influence in Nishāpūr and the ever increasing number of people who attended his lectures, adding to his renown, was already rankling in the minds of a group of scholars in the city. This coterie began to defame him, so much so that Shaykh Muḥammad bin Yahyā Dhuhlī had to say that anyone desirous of attending his lectures on the *Ḥadīth* should not attend Bukhārī's lectures. When Muslim heard this, he collected the *Aḥādīth* he had copied from Dhuhlī, and handing them over to him, said, "These *Aḥādīth* I had collected from you and am returning them. From now on I shall not quote any *Ḥadīth* on your authority. I can leave you but not Bukhārī." This shows how much regard Muslim had for Bukhārī because of which he gave up all mention of Dhuhlī from then onwards. Muslim has not narrated any *Ḥadīth* on the authority of Dhuhlī in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Nevertheless, Bukhārī, for whose sake Muslim had stopped reporting from Muḥammad bin Yaḥyā, has cited some *Aḥādīth* from Dhuhlī, although they are cited in a rather vague manner. Sometimes he says "حدثنى محمد" "Muḥammad has narrated to me" and at others "On the authority of

Muḥammad bin Khālid." It thus becomes difficult for most people to determine who is the narrator, since Dhuhlī is known more as Muḥammad bin Yaḥyā bin Khālid. Some persons asked Bukhārī: "When Muḥammad bin Yaḥyā criticizes you, why do you cite his narrations?" He replied: "Just because he criticizes me I cannot omit the *Aḥādīth* he has narrated." Perhaps the reason for Bukhārī's round-about reference to Yaḥyā might be that the attribution of a narrator to a connoisseur is almost tantamount to confirmation and acceptance of his criticism. However, Dhuhlī's animus against Bukhārī kept on becoming more and more virulent till at last, pressed hard by the hostility of Muḥammad bin Yaḥyā and other antagonists, the Imām had to leave Nīshāpūr.

Tolerance

A unique excellence of Imām Bukhārī was that he was for from being bigoted. When we study his collection of the *Aḥādīth*, we find many whose narrators were against Ahl-e-Sunnat. Imām Bukhārī never felt any scruples in reporting on their authority.

Simplicity and Contentment

Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) never wished, during his whole life, that he should derive benefit from the generosity and munificence of any king or noble. He had many opportunities of getting stipends but he never availed of them. He contented himself with whatever he got from his worthy father as legacy and met his needs by the scanty earnings from trade.[1]

Humility

There are very few persons who were lucky enough to achieve so much renown as he did. He had the felicity of seeing his renown with his own eyes. In spite of this, he did not feel it derogatory to his dignity that he should inquire from the most ordinary person about the thing he did not know. In the long list of his teachers we find the names of even his class-fellows and equals in age.

Exercise

Imām Bukhārī was very fond of physical exercise. He was expert in horse-riding and so skilled in archery that he always hit the bull's eye.

Austere Living

Imām Bukhārī was not a wordly-minded person. His life was extremely simple and devoted entirely to scholarly pursuits. At the same time he was very particular about tidiness so much so that he could not tolerate even a straw to lie on the floor.[2]

The Number of Ahadith in the Sahih Bukhari

The total number of the *Aḥādīth* in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is 9,082 which includes the repetitions and *mu'allaqāt (Aḥādīth* of questionable authority). Opinions differ as to the total number of excluded *Aḥādīth.* This point has been discussed by Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar at three places in the prolegomena to the *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, in the Egyptian edition of the same work at p.82 of Volume I, and then at the end of the book. A detailed discussion has been made on this subject in the prolegomena, still it is not clearly established what their real number is. On the other two occasions he has explicitly stated that excluding the repetitions and *mu'allaqāt*, the total number of the *Aḥādīth* comes to 2,513. In Qastallānī's prolegomena, which is really a summary of the prolegomena to the *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, it has been stated that the *Aḥādīth* number 2,600. Mawlānā Anwar

---

[1] Introduction to *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, page 480. [2] *Ibid*, page 482.

Shāh Kāshmīrī was inclined in favour of this number, and the number given in the *Fatḥ al-Bārī* was, according to him, due to oversight on the part of the scribe. However, we believe this to be improbable, since the same number has been mentioned on two occasions in the *Fatḥ al-Bārī* and it is difficult to lay the mistake twice at the door of the scribe.

Imam Bukhari's Death

We have earlier referred to the Governor of Bukhārā, Khālid bin Aḥmad Dhuhlī's harassment to Bukhārī because the latter did not agree to teach his sons to the exclusion of the other pupils. Dhuhlī could not take any direct action because of Bukhārī's fame and the respect in which he enjoyed in the world of Islam; he knew that no action taken by him by dint of his official position could be successful. He, therefore, persuaded Ḥarīth bin Warqā to arraign him with regard to the orthodoxy of his faith and thus injure the universal esteem in which he was held. Any steps taken after such a machination, would not arouse the sentiments of the people at large in his favour. He also pressed into service other venal shaykhs who accused Bukhārī of unorthodoxy, till the accusation reached a crescendo. After that he ordered Bukhārī to leave the city. Even now the same accusation was levelled that he believed the Qur'ān to be created. While leaving Bukhārā, the Imām said:

O God, would that whatever they (my adversaries) contemplated against me, should happen to their families and offspring!

اَللّٰهُمَّ اَرِهِمْ مَا قَصَدُوْنِيْ بِهٖ فِيْ
اَنْفُسِهِمْ وَاَوْلَادِهِمْ وَاَهْلِيْهِمْ۔

A few days afterwards, Khālid Dhuhlī was dismissed and disgraced, which was but a divine admonition to the wicked shaykhs also. During this very time Bukhārī was invited to Samarqand in view of the ordeals he was facing at Bukhārā. He set out for Samarqand and stayed at Khartank with his relations for a few days. There he received the news that in that city the shaykhs were divided in their approval of his visit: one group was opposed to his coming while the other favoured it. This news grieved him very much and during his *tahajjud* prayers he made a supplication to God, saying: "O God, Your earth has become too narrow for me despite its vast dimensions; so I beseech you to call me to yourself." Ḥāfiẓ 'Imād al-Dīn ibn Kathīr has discussed the justification for desiring death from this incident. The accepted view is that wishing for death is not proper, since it has been prohibited in the *Ḥadīth*. But in some reports recorded by Muslim, the following additional words occur: "لضر نزل به", that is, in face of worldly hardships, wishing for death is prohibited but if the security of Islam, its preaching and propagation are trammelled, it is justified. Bukhārī wished for death in the second case. He was being traduced on all flanks by jealous and hostile persons who had placed obstacles in the way of his teaching the *Ḥadīth*. So he prayed for death not because of his personal afflictions but because of hindrances in the preaching of the faith. Afterwards the people of Samarqand, having re-examined the matter and investigated the situation, agreed to call him to their city. Bukhārī received the news that all people were eagerly looking forward to his arrival. When he heard this, he asked for a horse, put on socks and wound the '*imāmah*.[1] He was propped on one side by Ghālib bin Jibra'īl and on the other by another person. But Bukhārī's prayer for death had been accepted. He had advanced only a few steps towards the horse when he said: "Weakness is overpowering me; leave me off." The persons propping him held back. Bukhārī offered his prayers; he was sweating profusely and expired in this very condition. His death fell on the night of the 'Īd al-Fiṭr 256 A.H. He was sixty-two years old short by thirteen days. He was buried at Khartank on the first of Shawwāl 256 A.H. after the Ẓuhr prayer. An overpowering fragrance came out of his grave, which, according to historians, was pleasanter than the odour of musk and amber. This was the result of the blessing of the most exalted in all the worlds, Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, the Prophet of God (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), whose *Aḥādīth* Bukhārī had collected so assiduously. People who used to visit Bukhārī's grave, would take away its dust as something auspicious. Therefore, a boundary wall was built around for its preservation.

How aptly do the following words of a poet apply to him:

أَجَامِعَ[2] أَخْبَارِ الرَّسُوْلِ لَكَ الْبُشْرٰى   لَقَدْ سُدْتَ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَقَدْ فُزْتَ فِي الْأُخْرٰى

(O thou collector of the *Aḥādīth*, tidings to you that you have undoubtedly become the Chief of the world and have achieved felicity in the world Hereafter.)

تشنف اٰذانا بِعِقْدِ جَوَاهِر   تَوَدُّ الْغَوَانِي لَوْ تَقَلَّدْنَهُ النَّحْرَا

(You have prepared ear-rings from such pearls that delicate damsels wish to wear them as ornaments.)

جَوَاهِرُكُمْ حَلَّتْ نُفُوْسًا نَفِيْسَةً   فَحَلَّتْ بِهَا صَدْرًا وَجَلَّتْ بِهَا قَدْرًا

(These are those very pearls from which pious men fashioned ornaments and enhanced their station by decorating themselves with them.)

Khaṭīb 'Abd al-Wāḥid bin Ādam has narrated that once he dreamt the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) waiting for someone in the presence of some of his Companions. He greeted the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) and asked: "My Lord, whom are you waiting for?" The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) replied: "I am waiting for Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī." A few days later, when Ādam heard about Bukhārī's demise, he tried to recall the time and date of his dream. Both tallied with the time and date of Bukhārī's death. Someone has composed a chronogram on the birth, age, and death of Imām Bukhārī in the following two couplets according to the *abjad* mode of chronogram-making:

كَانَ الْبُخَارِيُّ حَافِظًا وَّمُحَدِّثًا   جَمَعَ الصَّحِيْحَ مُكَمَّلَ التَّحْرِيْرِ
بخاریؒ حافظِ حدیث اور محدّث تھے۔   انہوں نے ایسی صحیح کو جمع کیا جو کامل اور منقح ہے۔

مِيْلَادُهٗ صِدْقٌ وَّمُدَّةُ عُمْرِهٖ   فِيْهَا حَمِيْدٌ وَّانْقَضٰى فِيْ نُوْرٍ
ان کا سالِ ولادت 'صدق' ہے مدتِ عمر ۱۹۴   'حمید' ہے، ۶۲ اور سالِ وفات 'نور' ہے ۲۵۶

(Bukhārī had learned by heart the *Aḥādīth*. He was a *muḥaddith* who collected the Tradition and compiled the *Ṣaḥīḥ* which is perfect.)

(His year of birth is given by *Ṣidq*,[3] the length of his life by *Ḥamīd*[4] and the year of his death by *Nūr*[5].)

---

[1] The headgear peculiar to theologians. [2] With a slight modification in a couplet of Athīr al-Dīn Abū Ḥabān. [3] That is, truth, veracity. The word *Ṣidq* is equivalent to 194. [4] Praised, laudable, glorious. *Ḥamīd* equates to 62. [5] Light, effulgence, luminosity. This adds upto 256.

مقدمہ

PROLEGOMENA

FADL AL-BARI

Commentary on the

SAHIH AL-BUKHARI

تعارف و حجیت حدیث پر ایک جامع ترین مقالہ

A Comprehensive Dissertation Explaining the Science of the Hadith as an Indispensable Source of Islam.

The dissertation which follows was written by Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyib (مد ظله العالى) under the title, "The Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*." The Qārī, who is the Rector of the Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband, wrote it at my request. A special distinction of this dissertation is that of all works of this eminent scholar, this was the only one read before the teaching staff of the Dār al-'Ulūm, and, while sending its manuscript he pointedly mentioned this fact, saying:

> This dissertation was read before the teaching staff of the Dār al-'Ulūm. The staff offered me considerable encouragement and said that the paper was unique in that no earlier writing on the subject offered such strong arguments against the denial of the *Ḥadīth*.

Editor

قرآن وحدیث

THE QUR'AN AND THE HADITH

By

HAKIM AL-ISLAM QARI MUHAMMAD TAYYIB

RECTOR, DAR AL-ULUM, DEOBAND.

وَأَنزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ

And We have revealed unto thee the Remembrance that thou mayst explain to mankind that which hath been revealed for them. (Qur'ān 16:44)

Islam is the last message from God, the last divine and revealed religion to man, the code of life for humanity till the world endures and the law for every man on earth. No religion, no *Sharī'ah* shall now come, for prophethood has ended, and the last of the Prophets has been amongst us. It, therefore, follows that the religion of the last Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is the final religion, his *Sharī'ah* (the law of God) the *ultima Thule* in the divine *Sharī'ah*. The book embodying it would then logically be the end-point in the succession of the Books of Revelation. It is, therefore, necessary that this religion and its cardinal principles should last for ever and remain preserved till the end of the world, otherwise neither *Dīn* (Islam) nor *Sharī'ah* will remain, for when no further *Sharī'ah* is to appear, Truth will entirely disappear from the face of the earth, since the world, as we know it, is based upon Truth and the celebration of Truth alone. It would be a fateful day, spelling destruction for this world, when all those who believe in God would disappear altogether. If this ever happens, the affairs of the world would become topsy-turvy. Therefore, it is impossible to visualise a time, or even a moment, when the world would be devoid of Truth and the name of God. So after termination of prophethood and the coming of the Last Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), with no other *Sharī'ah* to arise, there is no other means left for the preservation of Truth except that the survival of the final religion should be ensured and indemnified against the encroachments of time, and no vitiating or corrupting elements should creep into it, whatever the number of those who distort the message and whatever the multiplicity of the schismatic sects, whatever the degree of falsification and diverting the language from its genuine meaning. Despite all these, such a religion should reveal to us its pristine splendour, and should be intact in its entirety, as it was when it first appeared. It would be quite apparent that such a safeguard could not have been provided by a human agency. Man is a creature of changes. His mind, heart, intellectual celerity, natural proclivities, preferences, and even his intellectual demands are not static. Were it not so, how did it come about that the Pentateuch and the New Testament have left no trace? How is it that the original *Zabūr*[1] is no more?

---

[1] That is, the Psalms of David (Dā'ūd *'alaihi al-salām*).

Where are the Books of the Prophets *Ādam* and *Ibrāhīm* (عليهما السلام)? Had the responsibility for keeping a watch on the last of the religions given to men in the manner of the earlier religions, it would not have survived and the changing attitudes of the succeeding generations would have transformed it beyond recognition or repair. But, if the past religions did not last, the survival of the world was all the same ensured by the fact that Prophethood had not ended, and the place of the previous *Sharī'ah* was taken by a new one under the guidance of a new prophet. Thus, Truth did not lose its connection with the world, an eventuality which is bound to lead to its annihilation. But, after the end of Prophetic succession, it was not possible that the place of this religion should be taken by another and the world should come to an end. Therefore, God Himself made this eternal promise :

> Lo! We, even We, reveal the reminder,
> and lo ! We verily are its Guardian.
> (Qur'ān, 15:9)

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحٰفِظُونَ

Different Ways of Preserving Religion

There are obviously two conditions required for preserving religion. The first is the continuous raising of puissant personalities who have the innate zest and personal inclination to safeguard religion. They should be so eager to strengthen the boundaries of faith and action with their intellectual and practical powers that they should not brook even the slightest change or interference in them.

The second condition is that the religious canon should be itself so natural that it should have a built-in reserve for its preservation and perpetuation, and possess this overmastering spirit in such a high degree that it should be impervious to all sorts of changes and alterations. On the other hand, the strongest defence of such a religion lies in practical demonstration by its natural growth and innate vitality that it can ward off all dangers of change making it absolutely impossible for any false element to creep into it from any direction whatsoever. Hence, both these courses have been adopted to ensure the survival and preservation of Islam. The first was manifested in bringing forth persons in all such periods when any risk whatsoever of vitiation creeping into the Islamic faith or its constituents was felt, in whatever ways and modes. For instance, it is a matter of common observation that in the course of a century things naturally undergo some change because its close finishes one era, giving rise to another. Similarly, one whole generation comes to an end and makes way for another whose mental attitude certainly does not remain the same as that of the persons a hundred years before. Due to mental evolution the cast of the human mind is transformed ; ideologies and conceptions change and more advanced ideas and concepts come to the fore. Cultural trends do not remain as heretofore. Remarkable changes take place in the mode of life. Thus the new type of men living a century later is not the same as that living a hundred years ago. The commencement of every era, therefore, naturally posed this danger to Islam that the intellectual changes in the mind of the new generations should change its cast and superpose a fresh paint by peeling off the original one so that its original and pristine complexion should no longer remain worthy of attention or appreciation. Hence a promise was held out that towards the fag end of each century a *mujaddid* (Renovator) would be sent and such reformers would keep on reviving Islam and renovating it again and again, in ever so many ways, in accordance with the changed mental attitude of the newer generations. These worthy persons would clarify the cardinal principles and their subsidiaries in such a manner that all the new doubts and misunderstandings would be wholly exterminated. In this way the old problems would dawn on every age in a more clear and lucid manner by dint of new arguments and elucidations:

Undoubtedly, at the commencement of every century, God Almighty would continue bringing forth persons who would perpetually renew and renovate the religion (of Islām) for the *ummah*. (*Mishkāt*)

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ يَبْعَثُ لِهٰذِهِ الْأُمَّةِ عَلٰى رَأْسِ
كُلِّ مِائَةِ سَنَةٍ مَنْ يُّجَدِّدُ لَهَا دِيْنَهَا۔
(مِشْكٰوة شريف)

Live Groups Conforming to the Tenets of Islam

Despite the promise of centennial appearance of a *mujaddid* which has been thus provided for, there still lurked the danger that mischief-mongers, malfactors, deviates and hypocrites, disguising themselves as Muslims, might distort Islam, and by generating doubts and misgivings about it, try to make the believers sceptical. While the Muslims at large would be lying in wait for the arrival of a renovator, these malfactors and people with crooked minds would prove successful in spreading heresy among the Muslims through specious interpretations and well-disguised endeavours which would naturally undermine the very foundations of religion, thereby removing belief in faith from amongst the rank and file of Muslims. For this reason, the condition for sending a centennial reformer was further indemnified and a pledge was given assuring that even during the course of every century worthy successors to the righteous people of early days of Islam would continue to arrive from time to time. Thus during the course of the century and even in the midst of it, a time would never come when the *ummah* would not be blessed with such successors to their early forbears. Not only that but as a matter of fact they would certainly have the felicity of having such august persons as would be able to expose the misleading doctrines and insidious activities of the devils in human form by their true knowledge and insight and lucid religious arguments. Thus, they would not allow any harm to come to the Islamic faith. Apart from this divine assurance, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) too has said positively:

After *Salaf* (early Muslims), there will always be those among *khalaf* (later generations) who will expose misinterpretations of the exaggerators, the blank lies of the unrighteous and the vile misconstructions of the distorters and ignorant people, and thus nullify the nonsensical things said and professed by them (*Mishkāt*)

يَحْمِلُ هٰذَا الْعِلْمَ مِنْ كُلِّ خَلَفٍ
عَدُوْلُهٗ يَنْفُوْنَ عَنْهُ تَحْرِيْفَ الْغَالِيْنَ وَانْتِحَالَ
الْمُبْطِلِيْنَ وَتَأْوِيْلَ الْجَاهِلِيْنَ۔

There is inevitably some time lag and severance between the earlier and later generations (*salaf* and *khalaf*). Naturally some time elapses between the formation of a new generation after the outgoing one. It was feared that during this gap intervening between both these generations, when the latter has not reached the stage of maturity, the disbelieving elements might find the field empty and jump into it, and thus taking undue advantage of the situation, do the devil's work creating disruption and doubt in the mind of the *ummah* so that the *Dīn* (Islam) should be liable to disappear. The promise, therefore, was held out to the *ummah* that there would never pass a single moment when there would not be present a group of righteous men who would be succoured by God. In other words, the *ummah* should never feel perplexed or worried because this is not an *ummah* without a guardian; it is the *ummah* of a live Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) and the follower of a live *Sharī'ah*, one in which live groups, living according to the standard of the religion, would always exist. Accordingly it was said by the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم), as reported by Mu'āwiyah, who states:

> I have heard the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say that there would always be one party in his *ummah* which would stand for the right; neither shall it be disgraced by anyone's vilification nor shall anyone's animosity cause it any harm. This will continue right upto the Day of Judgment and such men will persist in righteousness.

سَمِعْتُ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لَا يَزَالُ مِنْ
أُمَّتِيْ أُمَّةٌ قَائِمَةٌ بِأَمْرِ اللّٰهِ لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ مَنْ خَذَلَهُمْ
وَلَا مَنْ خَالَفَهُمْ حَتّٰى يَأْتِيَ أَمْرُ اللّٰهِ وَهُمْ عَلٰى ذٰلِكَ۔

The Benefit of Islam in All Ages

There was yet another danger to the *ummah*. Supposing, with the passage of time, the danger arises that although the *Dīn* might still remain but it might not possess the same quality and potency which it enjoyed in the past; in this case merely its form would remain but not its spirit. It would be devoid of reality and as good as non-existent. It was, therefore, assured that the benefit of Islam for the *ummah* was not bound up with those who belong to any particular era, be it the earliest or the latest; on the other hand, its excellence and benefit would continue in its pristine sublimity and quality, and its original bliss would subsist in every age. That is why the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) said:

> Have good augury and tidings that my *ummah* is like the rain; it cannot be said whether its first shower was more useful for the land or the last one.

أَبْشِرُوْا أَبْشِرُوْا إِنَّمَا مَثَلُ أُمَّتِيْ مَثَلُ الْغَيْثِ
لَا يُدْرٰى آخِرُهٗ خَيْرٌ أَمْ أَوَّلُهٗ الخ

That is to say the benefit and felicity of Islam for the *ummah* is spread over centuries. The difference in degree shall no doubt be there, but the original good shall remain unchanged and shall be immutable. In the event, towards the end of every century, during its course, and every moment thereof, tidings have been given and pledges made through the mouth of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) of such persons who would prove divine protagonists and means for the preservation and protection of Faith and by dint of whose sterling qualities, the *Dīn* will remain intact and endure for ever in its genuine form and essence, with all its intrinsic attributes and magnitude, so that there never would be a fleeting moment in the history of the *ummah* when it would be cut off from Truth.

Two Fundamental Sources of Islam

It is, however, evident that the preservation of Islam depends upon external circumstances. The inherent strength of faith should be self-invigorating and self-preserving. The Muslim *Sharī'ah* by virtue of the principles on which it has been founded and the arguments that array themselves in its support, is divine in origin and imperishable, admitting of no intrusion whatsoever. This means that the other condition for the preservation of Islam has also been adopted, namely, that its authority has been permanently provided for inasmuch as Islam springs from two sources only which are the fountain-head of the *Sharī'ah* and the Faith—the Book of God and the *Sunnah* of the

Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). There are two more sources of Islam also: the *ijmā'* (consensus) and *qiyās* (analogical reasoning), compliance with both of which is undoubtedly imperative. God has, therefore, commanded the *ummah* to owe allegiance to these basic principles: submission to God, fealty to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and obedience to the "اولى الامر" (the authority). The third principle postulates compliance with the instances of judgment by competent persons called "راسخين فى العلم" (those steeped in learning), or matters unanimously agreed upon by similar contemporary qualified persons, as such matters certainly possess juridical authority. But the two last sources—the *ijmā'* and the *qiyās*—despite judicial authority do not constitute the basic Islamic canon but are subsidiary in nature. They have no independent authority unless they bear reference to the Qur'ān and the *Sunnah*, since anything on which a consensus has been arrived at can only be valid insofar as it primarily derives authority from these two standing bases. A consensus that is based on mere inclination or personal desire is not consensus at all, because consensus based on deviation is not possible in Islam. The same is true of analogical reasoning (*qiyās*). Its *maqīs* (analogous deduction) can only be credited if the *maqīs 'alaih* (that to which the analogy is applied) are to be found in the Qur'ān and the *Sunnah* and there is some connecting link between both to invest the unauthoritative with the force of the authoritative (*manṣūṣ*). Thus these two sources are not the Islamic canon (*Sharī'ah*) *per se* but are subordinate and subservient to the Qur'ān and the *Sunnah*. Consequently, there stand only two genuine bases of authority and *Sharī'ah* proper in Islam: the Book of God and the *Sunnah* of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Some scholars have added another source also—the *ijtihād* (legal or theological discretion) on the part of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), as sometimes he would, after waiting for some time, ordain on his own account, which, when confirmed through the descent of *waḥī* or tacit assent, was confirmed unto him, thereby acquiring the authority of *Sunnah*, otherwise it was immediately repealed with admonition through *waḥī*. In the event, therefore, the revelation still remained the ultimate reference, whether formally revealed or determined in the second manner. Thus the two cardinal sources remain the same—the Book of God and the *Sunnah*. Hence, ultimately, the Qur'ān and the *Sunnah* only remain duly proved standing authorities. And since these two alone constitute the *Sharī'ah* proper, both of which are higher than the subsidiary ones, nay, they constitute its very basis, therefore, just as the Qur'ān had combined these four sources in the matters to be obeyed (as has been just mentioned), similarly, on numerous occasions it has combined only these two sources as those to be followed. Thus the Qur'ān and the Tradition have been considered equivalent as regards authority, as is apparent from the following questions from various Sūrahs of the Qur'ān: Muḥāmmad Māidah, Anfāl and Aḥzāb :

Obey Allāh and obey the messenger, and render not your actions vain. (Qur'ān. 47:33)	أَطِيعُوا اللّٰهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَلَا تُبْطِلُوٓا أَعْمَالَكُمْ۔ محمد آیت ۳۳
Obey Allāh and the messenger and beware. (Qur'ān, 5:92)	وَأَطِيعُوا اللّٰهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَاحْذَرُوا۔ مائدہ آیت ۹۲

Obey Allāh and the messenger when he calleth you. (Qur'ān, 8:24)

اِسْتَجِيْبُوْا لِلّٰهِ وَلِلرَّسُوْلِ اِذَا دَعَاكُمْ - الانفال

And it becometh not a believing man or a believing woman, when Allāh and his messenger have decided an affair (for them), that they should (after that) claim any say in their affair. (Qur'ān, 33:36)

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَّلَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ اِذَا قَضَى اللّٰهُ
وَرَسُوْلُهٗ اَمْرًا اَنْ يَّكُوْنَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ اَمْرِهِمْ -

These *āyāt* show that the Qur'ān and the *Sunnah* are proved authorities with regard to the *Sharī'ah*, which, apart from investing the Qur'ān with authority, are proof patent for the authoritative stance of the *Ḥadīth* also. However, there is one difference between the two despite their equivalence in this respect. That of the Qur'ān is categorical while that of the *Aḥādīth* is based upon surmise except for those that are consecutive because the verity of the *Aḥādīth* is not of the same degree as that of the Qur'ān. Therefore, the degree of their proof is proportionate to that of their authority.

The Prophet: A Means of Bringing Light unto Darkness

Besides, the Qur'ān is the whole *Sharī'ah*, whereas the *Ḥadīth* is its exposition. The explanation of the significances and the objectives of the Qur'ān is not only difficult but in the very nature of things impossible without it because the Qur'ān is not only the basic code and canon of Islam but is a standing miracle also in respect of its words, meanings, expressions and significance. It is neither possible for a human agency to produce its equal in the arrangement of words, nor in style and symmetry. The same thing applies also to the comprehensive nature of its guidance and commandments, the depth of knowledge and esoteric matters, and the variety of themes it covers. Its subtlety of expression is such that the world could not produce its like in spite of its open challenge. Similarly, the vastness of its profound ideas and fathomless depths have frustrated all efforts to produce such a sublime work. It is, therefore, not surprising that its exegeses have been coming up in ceaseless succession. Its full understanding is as distant as ever, although the different exegesists have exhausted all the ingenuity they possessed in explaining its content. Even a small part of the Qur'ān is such as to be beyond the reach of the most ingenious and eloquent. Each layer and each fold of the Book of God hides rivers brimming with knowledge, which have been flowing for the last fourteen hundred years with the depth remaining unfathomed.

حرف حرفش راست اندر معنیٰ معنیٰ در معنیٰ در معنیٰ

(Each word of the Book contains, indeed, meanings within meanings.)

It is evident that it would be impossible for ordinary mortals to bring out the innumerable subtleties and profound meanings latent in each and every word of the Qur'ān. Had man's intellect been so advanced and his mind so deep then there is no reason why we should not have entertained the hope of producing such writing or achieving success in doing so to some extent, and its achievement should have been absolutely impossible. The reason why both men and genii cannot compose such a word, garbing the unlimited within the limited, the general within the particular, and the spaceless and timeless within time and space, is that their intellect, understanding and comprehension are devoid of the infinite and unlimited reach necessary for such a sublime work. The same handicap arises with regard to the interpretation of the Qur'ān also; here too our limitations impose an embargo upon our understanding. Hence God took upon Himself the elucidation and illustration of the Qur'ān and commissioned the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) as His interpreter. In other words, just as the essence of God is not circumscribed by limitations, so also are His attributes limitless. But man, in his inner and outer self, body and spirit, heart and mind, thought and understanding, intellect and insight, in fact, in every way, bears the surcingle of limitation round his whole being. By his very nature, he can not apprehend an object without delimitation, specification and identification. Such being the case, how can he approach the limitless essence and attributes of God, or gain an understanding thereof? God, consequently, created between Himself and the human beings an intermediate class of men which, through the attainment of a very high degree of perfection and excellence and the possession of supra-human characteristics, is comparatively closer to God and a symbol of His excellences. On the other hand, persons of this type, being finite, still remain human beings, and are really exemplars of perfect humanity.

اِدھر اللہ سے واصل اُدھر مخلوق میں شامل

(Joined with God, they are still associated with men.)

This class is the one which we call Prophets. These sacred persons are a means of contact between human beings, who are all darkness, and God, who is Absolute Light. When, therefore, an exemplar of divine excellences appears in the hallowed personality of a Prophet, it becomes easier for ordinary men to reach God, according to their capacity, through association with him. This becomes possible by virtue of the fact that the prophets are human beings, otherwise there is no other way in which the divine excellences could appear before us in a definite and concrete form—in flesh and blood—so that men could come into touch with them.

The Prophet's Words as a Means for Understanding the Qur'an

The words expressed by a Prophet, it is worth considering, are the result of some psychic condition which will not, of course, be sensual as the latter can affect any human being. They are, on the other hand, spiritual and godly. The words are, in fact, saturated in this state, and the direct consequence and objectification thereof. In other words that very state manifests itself in verbal form. Thereafter the expression rebounds to this very state, whereby it gains stronger roots in the heart. Thus the expression which we call revelation is, from beginning to end, dominated by the divine spirit. Consideration will show that the inner meaning and significance of such revealed expressions lie embedded in this state, for any expression that comes out is with a certain object demanded by an inner state. Naturally, therefore, the real purpose of the revelation can only be gleaned by one who is more or less conscious of such a state and is *en rapporte* with it. The urgings of a lover can only be realised by one who has experienced love; the aspiration of a jeweller can be but understood by a connoisseur of jewellery only. The word of God, would, therefore, be understandable to a certain extent by one who loves God and who is more or less conversant with such an experience. A man who is lacking in this consciousness and has had no such experience, may be able to gain insight into the literal sense, but it would normally be not possible for him to reach the inner meaning. As regards those who have never had such experience but on the contrary are averse or hostile to it, they cannot, in the very nature of things, understand the divine intent even if they are made to understand it, thereby fulfllling the purpose of bringing home the meaning to them. Even if they, by chance, partly follow the matter through the words, they cannot become connoisseurs in it, so that its secrets are revealed to them, and they experience the states infused in them, thereby opening the gates of gnosis so that a man becomes an expositor in the real sense of the term. It is evident that the Attributes of God—particularly that of knowledge, together with the special-most of attributes—articulation, which expresses and interprets—have their greatest manifestation in the Qur'ān, which, because of its dealing with fundamental and subsidiary principles, its comprehensive nature and the infinite divine splendours which it reflects, is as unlimited in verities, profundities and significances as God Himself and does not comprise and comprehend one but thousand varieties of sciences of the past and future. As the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) has said :

In it (the Qur'ān) there are stories of the past, portents of the future, and the orders prevailing in the period in between. It is a settled fact and not a joke. The proud one who ignores it shall have his neck broken by God, and he who seeks guidance elsewhere shall be led astray. It is the strong rope of God ; it is the memorabilia of wisdom ; it is the straight road ; it is a thing that prevents the impulses from going awry and the language from becoming doubtful. The scholars never get their fill from it; it does not get hackneyed through persistent recitation ; its wonders appear in never-ending trains. It is the same (word of God) which, when heard by the jinns made them desist from transgression and they exclaimed : 'Wonderful words have we heard—words that take us towards nobility; we have believed in them.' Indeed whoever utters them, speaks the truth ; he who follows the Qur'ān obtains his rewards; he who adjudges according to it, acts justly; he who calls others towards it is vouchsafed the right direction. O A'war[1] ! hold it strongly.

فِيْهِ نَبَأُ مَا قَبْلَكُمْ وَخَبَرُ مَا بَعْدَكُمْ وَحُكْمُ
مَا بَيْنَكُمْ وَهُوَ الْفَصْلُ لَيْسَ بِالْهَزْلِ مَنْ تَرَكَهُ مِنْ
جَبَّارٍ قَصَمَهُ اللهُ وَمَنِ ابْتَغَى الْهُدٰى فِىْ غَيْرِهٖ
اَضَلَّهُ اللهُ وَهُوَ حَبْلُ اللهِ الْمَتِيْنُ وَهُوَ الذِّكْرُ
الْحَكِيْمُ وَهُوَ الصِّرَاطُ الْمُسْتَقِيْمُ وَهُوَ الَّذِىْ
لَا يَزِيْغُ بِهِ الْاَهْوَاءُ وَلَا تَلْبَسُ بِهِ الْاَلْسِنَةُ
وَلَا يَشْبَعُ مِنْهُ الْعُلَمَاءُ وَلَا يَخْلَقُ مِنْ كَثْرَةِ
الرَّدِّ وَلَا تَنْقَضِىْ عَجَائِبُهٗ هُوَ الَّذِىْ لَمْ تَنْتَهِ
الْجِنُّ اِذْ سَمِعَتْهُ حَتّٰى قَالُوْا اِنَّا سَمِعْنَا قُرْاٰنًا
عَجَبًا يَّهْدِىْ اِلَى الرُّشْدِ فَاٰمَنَّا بِهٖ مَنْ قَالَ بِهٖ
صَدَقَ وَمَنْ عَمِلَ بِهٖ اُجِرَ وَمَنْ حَكَمَ بِهٖ عَدَلَ
وَمَنْ دَعَا اِلَيْهِ هُدِىَ اِلٰى صِرَاطٍ مُّسْتَقِيْمٍ خُذْهَا
اِلَيْكَ يَا اَعْوَرُ۔[1]

The Qur'ān is a work that is very comprehensive, varied and full of knowledge embracing the history of the past, knowledge of the future and matters of the present age ; it is so true that practising upon it would merit the highest recompense ; its commands are equitable, its invitation to those strayed in the tenebrity of ignorance is the quintessence of the purest ethics and its wonders know no bounds. The scholars will never be satiated with this Book, their search will not be cloyed. The treatment of principles in the Book, both fundamental and subsidiary, represent the very apogee of perfection and each word of it breathes truth and knowledge. The sublime expression of the Qur'ān is so all-embracing that its language comprehends all branches of knowledge; and from its eloquence flow profound spiritual significances. In it there are *āyāt* that are clear; those that require greater penetration, and those which are characterized by eloquence and sublimity. Where one *āyah* is *khafī* (subtle), another is *mujmal* (laconic), and still another difficult or suggestive. Their apparent and hidden meanings still further sway the inner feelings and the psychological make-up of man. They embrace psychology, parapsychology, theology, political science, and so on. Therefore, extracting meaning from such an awe-inspiring and miraculous work would not have been possible without guidance from God. The only alternative, therefore, lay in its being interpreted by one who should be earthly like us but because of his clear heart and exalted intellect, should be heavenly. His mind should be full of reflection of divine graces pertaining to Qur'ānic words; he should be fully conversant with and steeped through and through in those spiritual states from which those divine words have emerged and reached him. He should be helped by God Who Himself should have made him understand His intent and have so cultivated his mind that his whole spirit should have become one with the miraculous word of God so that he should be able to deduce and discover the comprehensive meaning of the Qur'ān to bring it nearer to our understanding. Evidently the exposition of the Qur'ān would only be by words of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself, who first heard the divine words from God, understood them with His Guidance, and thereafter made his listeners understand them with the same ardour and enthusiasm. God, therefore, first made the Qur'ān descend upon the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) followed by the Traditions so that after reciting the *āyāt* their implications should be instilled into the minds of the Muslims and they might be made to understand them, which can evidently be only by means of speech (instruction). The only approach to explaining the Qur'ān could have been through the tone and tenor, expression, and circumstantial needs, as also by means of the profound effect of words to instil the meaning into the hearts of the hearers. Not only that but the intent should be made to harmonize with their minds in such a manner that the Word of God should penetrate into them leaving not the least scope for any other contrary meaning. On this count it can be definitely claimed that just as we could not gain access to God without the mediation of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), so also would it not be possible for our understanding to grasp the significance of the Divine Book without the medium of the Traditions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

---

[1] According to Tirmidhī (Ch. Bāb Mā Jā'a fī Faḍl al-Qur'ān, *ḥadīth* No. 3,070) who has called it a *gharīb ḥadīth*, 'Alī (*raḍi allāh 'anho*) quoted these words of the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) in reply to a question by one A'war.

The Responsibility for the Descent of the Qur'an and its Exegesis

God Almighty took upon Himself the task of transmitting His laws and message, as man by himself was not competent to frame such a comprehensive and eternal code of law. Likewise, the task of transmitting the explanation and interpretation of divine words and message also was taken up by God, since man, by the very nature of his limited comprehension, could not gain entry into the innermost significance, hidden meanings and the objectives of the Qur'ān. When the descent of the *waḥī* commenced, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) first used to learn the words by rote and to repeat them with his tongue, so that these words may be etched upon his mind. God, however, restrained the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) from doing so.

Stir not thy tongue herewith to hasten it. (Qur'ān, 75:16)	لَا تُحَرِّكْ بِهِ لِسَانَكَ لِتَعْجَلَ بِهِ۔

Later He directed the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) to keep on listening only to the Divine Words:

> And when we read it (the Qur'ān) follow thou the reading. (Qur'ān, 75:18)
>
> فَإِذَا قَرَأْنَاهُ فَاتَّبِعْ قُرْآنَهُ

God again committed Himself to the charge by saying:

> Lo! upon Us (resteth) the putting together thereof (in you heart) and the reading thereof (with your tongue). (Qur'ān, 75:17)
>
> إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا جَمْعَهُ وَقُرْآنَهُ

This promise obviously relates to the preservation of the words of of the *waḥī* in the heart of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), since the movement of the Prophet's tongue and the recitation of the *waḥī* are concerned with the words only, not the meaning; the latter is not a thing to be learnt by rote or by recitation. Therefore, God's promise that He shall guard the revelation and preserve it word for word till eternity has been supported by the above *āyah*.

As for the meaning and the inner significance of the *waḥī*, this too was not left to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). It never happened that reflecting upon the *āyah* of the Qur'ān he should say that one meaning of a particular *āyah* might be either this or that, and since such and such an explanation would be more in keeping with the words, this was what was meant by God Almighty. Nay, it is God who took upon Himself the task of explaining the connotation, purpose and meaning of each *āyah*, saying:

> Then lo! upon Us (resteth) the explanation thereof. (Qur'ān 75:19)
>
> ثُمَّ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا بَيَانَهُ ۔ القیمۃ آیت ۱۹

It is obvious that this explanation or exposition is something other than the *Qirā'at* the responsibility for which was taken in the first part of this *āyah*; otherwise the second part would be superfluous. Then again, to read out or recite is tantamount to *Qirā'at*, and not to exposition (*bayān*), which aims at expatiation and clarification of a hidden, vague or obscure point that may not be within the human ken. When, therefore, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) had heard the words of the *waḥī* and had fully grasped their significance, there is little point in exposition, for besides being contrary to the idiom and usage, it would be trying to attain what is already achieved, technically known as *muḥāl* (impossible). Inevitably, therefore, *bayān* does not pertain to the words from the point of language, idiom and reason. This leaves only the meanings and significances which still remain obscure to the listener after hearing the words. Therefore it becomes clear that the word *bayān* (exposition) applies to the meaning and significance, being linguistically also formed for them. The sum and substance of all this discussion, therefore, is that God took upon Himself the task of transmitting the meanings of the different verses of the Qur'ān.

God Has Not Authorised Anyone to Interpret the Qur'an

This discourse shows that both the words and the meanings of the Qur'ān are from God; the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is not a claimant to either, but is the transmitter and trustee thereof, that is, not only the narration of words and their collation and recitation are from God but exposition of their meaning, annotation and determination of intent were also from Him. Obviously when the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) to whom the Qur'ān was revealed, was kept subservient to the All Highest in explaining the significance of the Qur'ān, how could the *ummah* be authorised to determine its meaning and significance? It would be preposterous to suggest that the *ummah* could arrogate to itself the right to allocate meanings to this verse or that or to act as *mujtahid*. God Almighty, therefore, kept the *ummah* subordinate to divine interpretation and made over the rehearsal and reproduction of that very Exposition to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) by which He had made him grasp the significance and intent of His message, so that he might explain to the *ummah* the nature of the Divine intent:

''وانزلنا الیک الذکر لتبین للناس مانزل الیهم و لعلهم یتفکرون'' "And We have revealed unto thee the Remembrance that thou mayst explain to mankind that which hath been revealed for them, and that haply they may reflect".
(Qur'ān 16 : 44)

Even *tafakkur* (pondering) was placed after the understanding of the significance of the Qur'ān, so that pondering should not determine the meaning but operate within the limits of the meanings already determined by Exposition and thus only the intents of God may be unfolded by reflecting and those not intended should not be introduced under cover of the words. Such thinking cannot be equated with Divine Knowledge but would be mere arbitrary imaginings and gross delusions. It would not be Divine Wisdom but futile ratiocination. At another place the Qur'ān says :

And We have revealed the Scripture unto thee only that thou mayst explain unto them that wherein they differ.
(Qur'ān, 16:64)

وَمَآ اَنْزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتٰبَ اِلَّا لِتُبَيِّنَ
لَهُمُ الَّذِى اخْتَلَفُوْا فِيْهِ -

It is quite manifest that this conflict would either relate to the Qur'ān so that people should create differences and raise controversies about the meanings of its *āyāt* or to the affairs of the world, for which every party, in order to support its own stand, would quote from the Qur'ān, thereby creating differences about their real character. The remedy for both of those was declared to be the exposition made by the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) himself so that the real nature of the meaning of the *āyāt* and the affairs may be established. So *vis-a-vis* two rival contentions such an exposition would help in their appraisal and deciding which one is preferable. This is only possible when such an exposition is other than the Qur'ān. If it is the Qur'ān, the meanings of which are being disputed, then how can these very controversial significances decide the matter between contending parties? The Holy Prophet's exposition, which is divinely inspired, therefore, would be a verity other than that of the Qur'ān. This would act as the court of the last resort in face of the conflicts and would be disposed in favour of the most preferable view out of the views of the various parties and individuals, thereby removing the difference and bringing forth what is right.

Hadith : An Exposition of the Qur'an

It is evident, therefore, that the *Ḥadīth* is something other than the Qur'ān. It clearly unfolds the Qur'ānic eternal truths and hidden significances. Since it has also emerged from the same light from which the Qur'ān did, it possess the power to bring out that light which no other writing possesses. Whether anything is in the nature of a statement (*qawl*) or act (*'amal*), silence (*sukūt*) or speech (*taqrīr*), it is called *bayān* in the language of the Qur'ān. According to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) this is called *Ḥadīth* or *Sunnah*, which is evident from his words حدثوا عنى "Quote from me" and عليكم بسنتى "Follow my example". It removes all obscurities in the Qur'ān; it says in detail what has been said in brief therein; it is an exegesis for the difficult points in the Qur'ānic text, elucidation of what is subtle, and explication of its gnomic points without which there is no way out to settle the different disputes and determine the intents of God. Thus the *Aḥādīth* are an elaboration of the whole of the Qur'ān while each *ḥadīth* explains some *āyah*. Since the implication of each *āyah* is different, these elaborations are also varied. Therefore the different kinds of *Aḥādīth* in relation to the Qur'ānic *āyāt* have been designated by different names.

We give below examples of the different names by which the *Aḥādīth* are designated :-

(i) CONFIRMATORY STATEMENT (*bayān-i-tākīd*): where the themes of the *āyah* and the *ḥadīth* are one and the same.

(ii) PERSPICUOUS STATEMENT (*bayān-i-ta'yyun*) : where one of the obscure points among the many of an *āyah* has been made manifest.

(iii) EXPOSITORY STATEMENT (*bayān-i-taqrīr*): where the command given in an *āyah* is obscure in respect of measures and has been fixed by the *Ḥadīth*.

(iv) ELUCIDATORY STATEMENT (*bayān-i-tafṣīl*): here the brevity of the *āyah* is dilated upon.

(v) SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT (*bayān-i-ilḥāq*): This is where the *ḥadīth* links up something left out an *āyah* with that *āyah*, e.g. part of some incident or the premises of an argument.

(vi) EXPLANATORY STATEMENT (*bayān-i-tawjīh*) : this explains the *raison d'etre* behind a Qur'ānic commandment.

(vii) SYNEDOCHEIC STATEMENT (*bayān-i-tamthīl*) : where the general principle of an *āyah* has been explained in point of detail in *Aḥādīth*.

(viii) CAUSATIVE STATEMENT (*bayān-i-ta'līl*): the explanation of the cause of an *āyah*.

(ix) PERSUASIVE STATEMENT (*bayān-i-tāthīr*): where the special characteristics and the persuasive nature of an *āyah* have been described.

(x) DELIMITING STATEMENT (*bayān-i-taḥdīd*): where the limits of an *āyah* have been indicated.

(xi) IDENTIFICATORY STATEMENT (*bayān-i-takhṣīṣ*) : where in the description of an *āyah* the general description is specifically correlated to a particular person.

(xii) ANALOGICAL STATEMENT (*bayān-i-qiyās*): where a section resembling a section of the Qur'ānic *āyah* is described on the basis of some common effective cause.

(xiii) DEDUCTIVE STATEMENT (*bayān-i-tafrī'*): where a section of the *āyah* is explained through a section of the *Ḥadīth* on the basis of some common factor.

(xiv) DERIVATIVE STATEMENT (*bayān-i-istikhrāj*): in which from the general principles contained in a section of the Qur'ān, the *ḥadīth* has derived a particular one.

There are many other kinds of exposition which we have not mentioned lest the catalogue grow too long. In sum, the *Ḥadīth* is the exposition of the Qur'ān comprising several kinds assorted by their thematic content, which accordingly determines their names and designations.

Determining the Relationship between the Qur'an and the Sunnah

It will now be up to the *mujtahid* or the scholar to identify the nature of a *Ḥadīth*, to connect it with the relevant Qur'ānic *āyah*, and to trace its origin in the Qur'ān. But it is not everyone's task to undertake a work of this nature, nor is everyone equipped, mentally or otherwise, to determine the nature of this relationship and to issue a fiat on this relation. Only those well versed in analogical reasoning (*ijtihād*) and ratiocination can have command over this complex branch of knowledge, and, by the grace of God, are in a position to transmit their findings to the generality of the scholars.

Ḥadīth As Standing Authority of *Sharī'ah*

In any case, all the commands given by the *Aḥādīth* are derived from the Qur'ān and are an exposition thereof, although their particular nature has given rise to two forms. One of them being subordinate to the Qur'ān, should be called exposition of the Qur'ān, even though the relationship between the two be subtle and cannot be discovered without deep knowledge. The second is juridical. From this viewpoint the *Ḥadīth* should constitute a permanent source of and standing authority for Islamic jurisprudence. Therefore, those *nuṣūṣ* (texts) of the Qur'ān which pronounce the *Ḥadīth* as exposition, indicate its subordinate and derivative nature, while those which show it to be a source of the *Sharī'ah*, declare its commandments to be like Qur'ānic commandments and make it analogous to the Qur'ān as bearing the authority of *Sharī'ah*, as has been explained in this *ḥadīth*:

And indeed, the Prophet of God has prohibited certain things just as God has done,

وَإِنَّ مَا حَرَّمَ رَسُوْلُ اللهِ كَمَا حَرَّمَ اللهُ

or has been stated in the following *ḥadīth*:

Be aware that I have been given the Qur'ān and its analogue also. (*Abū Dā'ud*)

أَلَا إِنِّيْ أُوْتِيْتُ الْقُرْاٰنَ وَمِثْلَهٗ مَعَهٗ (ابوداؤد)

These show that particular aspect of the *Ḥadīth* which invests it with an independent position in respect of the *Sharī'ah*. There is, however, another facet to the *Ḥadīth*—certain commands are contained in the *Ḥadīth* but not in the Qur'ān as evidenced by the *ḥadīth* reported by Maqdām bin Ma'dī Karb, which unequivocally establishes the authoritative stance and independent position of the Tradition in respect of *Sharī'ah*. According to it the meat of the domestic ass (*ḥimār ahlī*) is prohibited, although it is not prohibited by the Qur'ān. Likewise, the meat of carnivorous or hunting animals has been forbidden by the *Ḥadīth* and not by the Qur'ān. These and many other commandments which derive from the Tradition show the independent nature of the *Ḥadīth* as the source of *Sharī'ah* apart from the Qur'ān. Sometimes even the link between the *Ḥadīth* and the Qur'ān is not visible, which is contrary to the *Ḥadīth* being exposition of the Qur'ān and the assumption made above to the effect that all the *Aḥādīth* are but exposition of the Qur'ān.

The answer to this would be that such reports and commands cannot escape being exposition of the Qur'ān, for, even if they do not appear in any particular *āyah* in part, they would, on the whole, be an exposition of the following *āyah* in which the matter has been put down as a general rule:

مَا اٰتٰكُمُ الرَّسُوْلُ فَخُذُوْهُ وَمَا نَهٰكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوْا۔ (الحشر آيت)

Whatever the messenger giveth you, take it, and whatsoever he forbiddeth, abstain (from it). (Qur'ān, 59:7)

Thus all commandments of this type made by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) are an exposition of the above *āyah*. Here the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has been directed to issue commands on his own and the legal decisions are declared to be parallel to those of the Qur'ān. By this token the two *Aḥādīth* quoted above are, according to this *āyah* (59:7), expositions of the latter, and all the commandments given by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) consequently stand confirmed as the exposition of the Qur'ān. The Companions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the virtuous ones of the succeeding generation (*salaf ṣāliḥīn*) called such commands of permanent nature Qur'ānic commandments and exposition of the Qur'ān according to this very *ḥadīth*. Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin Mas'ūd (رضى الله عنه) was once asked by an old woman: "You curse a tattooing woman (*dāshimah*), but nowhere in the Qur'ān has tattooing been prohibited." Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin Mas'ūd (رضى الله عنه) replied: "I wish thou hadst been reading the Qur'ān. Does it not say "ما آتاكم الرسول" (whatever the messenger giveth you..)? The old woman said, "Yes, so is it written." Ḥaḍrat Mas'ūd (رضى الله عنه) then said: "If so, because of this authority the Prophet of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has cursed the tattooing woman and has commanded us to desist from this abominable act. This command of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), by virtue of being an exposition of this *āyah*, has become a Qur'ānic command itself."

Another episode regarding the permanent nature of the *Ḥadīth* as a primary source of the *Sharī'ah* relates to Imām Shāfi'ī. Once, when Imām Shāfi'ī was in the precincts of Ka'bah, he said with a scholar's exuberant confidence: "Today I propose to reply every question on the authority of the Qur'ān." One of those present asked: "Where is the commandment to kill a wasp within the precincts of Ka'bah in the Qur'ān, which is permitted by the Shāfi'ī school?" Imām Shāfi'ī replied: the *āyah*: ما آتاكم الرسول "Whatever the messenger giveth you, take it," shows that it is obligatory upon us to obey the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), while the *ḥadīth*

اِقْتَدُوْا بِاللَّذَيْنِ مِنْ بَعْدِيْ اَبُوْبَكْرٍ وَّعُمَرَ۔

Follow *Abū Bakr* and *'Umar* after me.

makes it obligatory to follow both Abū Bakr and 'Umar. And since 'Umar has said: يقتل الزنبور فى الحرم "The wasp can be killed in Ka'bah," this command is derived from the *āyah*, and, being its exposition, constitutes a Qur'ānic commandment.

In sum, two aspects of the *Ḥadīth* stand established. One is its derivative aspect, being an elaboration of the Qur'ān, and the other is its subtle relationship with the Qur'ān, being its standing authority, even though it is the elaboration of the latter. But manifestly, since the commandments of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) are proof of the Qur'ānic text, the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* are kindred. The *Ḥadīth*, therefore, logically branches off into two kinds: (i) as a primary source, (ii) as the derivation of the Qur'ānic text. From the viewpoint of the Qur'ān it will be regarded as derived, for it is its exposition (and exposition is subservient to what it discusses) and from the juridical point of view would be equated with the original source, as legal principles are derived from it also. The *Ḥadīth* is, therefore, a great intermediary (*barzakh-i-kubrā*) which acquires knowledge from the Qur'ān and passes it on to *fiqh*. Were the *Ḥadīth* not there, no connecting link between the Qur'ān and *fiqh* could have been possible, and the same is true of the significance.

Relation of *Ḥadīth* to the Qur'an and Muslim Jurisprudence

The importance of the *Ḥadīth* recognized by the *ummah*, therefore, does not lie in its being a science, as it is nothing but exposition of the Qur'ān and the text of *fiqh*. Without the *Ḥadīth* neither can the Qur'ān be understood nor *fiqh* evolved. There is no example anywhere in the world that comes anywhere near the large number of men who gathered during the Umayyad and Abbasid periods for recording texts of the *Ḥadīth* and recitations therefrom. This shows in ample measure what pains were taken to perpetuate and preserve the *Ḥadīth* and to use it as a medium for deriving conclusions and law-making on almost every problem under the sun. This intense activity about the *Ḥadīth* was, in fact, an activity for understanding the Qur'ān and evolving jurisprudence. The *fiqh* that has evolved from general principles of the Qur'ān and the *Sunnah* is like a perfect tree that has sprung from their seeds; its root is the Qur'ān; its trunk the *Ḥadīth*, and the foliage and the flowers that adorn it are *fiqh* and analogical reasoning.

We are not presently concerned with the nature of the juristic and deductive (*ijtihādī*) problems in Islam, and on what authority they rest. We have only to shed light on the evolution and growth of *fiqh* and its existence, since it is the result of the *Ḥadīth* and the fruit of the Qur'ān. This could not have been possible without the medium of the *Ḥadīth* which joins two disparate elements. That is to say, it connects the word of the *mujtahids* with that of God. Thus, as man cannot gain access to God without the medium of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), who is the connecting link between God and man, similarly between the Word of God and the word of the *mujtahids* there is the connecting link provided by the word of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). Without this the word of men can derive no authority from the Word of God. Therefore any group of Muslims which relinquishes the *Ḥadīth* cannot hope to gain access either to the Qur'ān or *fiqh*. In other words, it would be bereft of the authority and the source of Islam. It will be a slave to its own imaginings—Satanic imaginings—which it would equate with the commandments of God although, leave alone the Word of God and that of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), it would not have even the capability to understand the writing of the jurists.

The Scope Allowed in Questioning the Authority of *Aḥādīth*

Thus the *Ḥadīth* of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) constitutes an authority for the ***Sharī'ah***, a source of subsidiary laws, and the clearest exposition and exegesis of the Qur'ān. A *ḥadīth* may be conjectural and dubious inasmuch as it needs authentication, but it is intrinsically as absolute as the Qur'ān itself. If a given *ḥadīth* is said to be putative (*ẓannī*), it is not because of the *ḥadīth* itself but the way it has been transmitted. If the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) had directly communicated any command made in any *ḥadīth* to us, we would have been bound to obey it like the commandments of the Qur'ān. If any difference has arisen it is not because of being the word of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), but because of the transmissional chain due to which the question of its being really the command of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) arose, not that compliance with his command became questionable, for the imperative nature of the *Ḥadīth* stands proven by: "ما آتاكم الرسول" "Whatever the messenger giveth you.." To acknowledge the *Ḥadīth* is to believe in the Qur'ān, and to negate it is to deny the Qur'ān. Obedience to it is similarly obedience to God. "من يطع الرسول فقد اطاع الله" "Whoso obeyeth the messenger, obeyeth Allāh." (Qur'ān, 4:80). Therefore it is absolutely obligatory to follow both. Thus the discussion revolves not round the *Ḥadīth* itself but the *isnād* and the narrations. If the *isnād* and narration of a *ḥadīth* are just like the narration of the Qur'ān, it would bear the stamp of authenticity like the confirmed *Aḥādīth* and it would be obligatory to obey it. If the authority and proof behind a *ḥadīth* are open to doubt, it will become putative. Hence the question of the negation of *Ḥadīth* or denial of its authority does not arise, though the scope for questioning the veracity does arise, which is not tantamount to denial of the *Ḥadīth* or its being due authority. If anyone makes a denial on this basis, he is mistaken, for the maximum effect of it can be that the authority should be thoroughly examined. The *isnād* will enable us to fix the *Aḥādīth* in an hierarchical order with regard to their authenticity and each *ḥadīth* will, therefore, be arranged in accordance with the degree of authenticity it bears. If the authorities of the narrators of a *ḥadīth* are all, according to the criterion, trustworthy, just and possess retentive power, and the chain of narrators is continuous and consistent, then it would be acceptable, otherwise it would not be of high order.

Evidently, the fact of transmissional chain being open to exception means only that a particular *ḥadīth* is not absolute or does not stand proven, not that the *Ḥadīth* itself as a genre has no authority or the word of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) does not carry authority. This would be like a traveller who does not reach his goal because of something wrong with the road and says that the goal does not exist or has become extinct. Thus a weak or unreliable transmissional chain does not involve the negation of the *Ḥadīth*. Therefore in principle, there is no scope for this on the mere ground of weak transmission of the *Aḥādīth*. At the utmost, it furnishes scope for denying a particular authority on which a *ḥadīth* is based, technically known as maimed according to the connoisseurs, which is not denial of *Ḥadīth* but simply the critique of the authority.

Provisions in the Qur'an for Sustaining and Preserving the *Ḥadīth*

It is the height of temerity that the denial of the *Ḥadīth* should be based on the Qur'ān itself, in spite of the fact that the Qur'ān explicitly calls the *Ḥadīth* its exposition, emphasizes its importance, tells us that God Almighty has taken responsibility for it, and describes the Prophet of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) as the surrogate of the charge which He has. In short, the science of *Ḥadīth* cannot be denied on the basis of the *sanad* (authority), for in that case, the maximum thing that can be maintained is the denial of a particular authority or subjecting it to criticism, which cannot be called its denial; it is simply its criticism, both of which, denial and criticism, cannot be mixed up; nor can the *Ḥadīth* be denied under cover of the Qur'ān when the Qur'ān unequivocally calls the *Ḥadīth* its own exposition and indicates God's responsibility therefor.

Keeping in view the elaborate arrangements made by the Qur'ān for sustaining and preserving the science of the Tradition, to consider it the basis for denial of *Ḥadīth*, makes little sense. It is sheer impertinence to deny the science of the Tradition because if this fake principle is adopted, then even the Qur'ān cannot be acknowledged inasmuch as it too has reached us through intervening media. Similarly, if it is held that the *Ḥadīth* is not acceptable as its narrators are not numerically and qualitatively like those of the Qur'ān, that is, not so many and such as those of the Qur'ān, the only conclusion we can reach is that since such and such a *ḥadīth* does not possess the degree of testimony enjoyed by the Qur'ān, it is not admissible of as absolute proof as the Qur'ān, not that we do not believe in Tradition itself. To say that the narrators are not as numerous and as unimpeachable as they should be, only reflects upon the degree of authenticity, not on the *Ḥadīth*. In any case, this does not provide a way of escape for the negators of the *Ḥadīth*. The most that such doubting Thomases can say is: "We accept that the science of the *Ḥadīth* is the exposition of the Qur'ān, because the proof therefor is forthcoming in the Qur'ān itself, but it is not obligatory upon us to accept its classification into different kinds and to accord our tacit approval to particular persons mentioned in the transmissional chain, when the Qur'ān has not indicated any particular kinds of *Ḥadīth* with persons."

The answer to such a statement would be that, in the first place, this scruple is senseless. If the Qur'ān indicates a general matter, then its particular illustrations and minutae should be searched for in its history and not in the pages of the Qur'ān. If the Qur'ān were to adopt the approach that follows from this assumption, it would not be a basic constitution at all but a compendium of by-laws and polymathia, which is obviously against the dignity of the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān has only laid down the fundamentals of the *Sharī'ah*. To seek for particular applications in the Qur'ān would be to demonstrate our ignorance of the making of fundamental laws; even more, a living proof of our insensitivity to the significance of such laws. Therefore, when the science of *Ḥadīth* has been agreed upon as being specifically proven from the Qur'ānic text, then the acts based upon its principles and the different kinds of *Aḥādīth* have also to be acknowledged as proven. There is no scope left whatsoever, consequently, for denying a derivation after the original has been acknowledged.

Four Kinds of the *Ḥadīth* With Respect to the Number of Narrators

One point which could be raised with a certain degree of validity on this score, is that, if the Qur'ān has itself proved the science of the *Ḥadīth* and shed light on its significance, then one example or two of this all-important principle should also have been given, so that we should have been able to understand the *raison d'etre* of the broad scope and classification of *Aḥādīth*. This would have enabled the coming generations to prepare the ground for classifying and determining the scope of the different *Aḥādīth*.

As I would describe later, this point has been fully taken care of by the Qur'ān. It has not only illustrated the different kinds of *Aḥādīth*, but also fully highlighted the role of authenticity and narrators in regard to *Aḥādīth*. The Qur'ān has, therefore, defined the basic kinds of *Aḥādīth* and through this definition, specified their nature with the status of each *Ḥadīth* fixed by means of the number of narrators and their reliability in point of veracity. Before we discuss what the Qur'ān has said, let us examine how the *muḥaddithīn* have divided the *Aḥādīth* into different classes from which lateral and collateral branches have ramified. So far as one's intelligence can make out, only four varieties of *Ḥadīth* are possible which have been accorded the highest status by the *muḥaddithīn* in the terminology of *Ḥadīth*.

(i) Single Narrative (*Khabar-i-gharīb*)—Such a *ḥadīth* is based on a single narrator who has recorded the statement or act of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and from him it continues to the last link of the transmissional chain. Even if the number of the intermediate authorities is more than one, it would be counted as being a single individual's narration. Such a *ḥadīth* is technically known as the *khabar-i-gharīb* or *khabar-i-fard*, according to the *muḥaddithīn*. Although it does not admit of absolute conviction, still it raises a presumption in its favour, and is acknowledged in all affairs of life and faith. It can not only be not laid aside, but its acceptance is bespoken as an admitted and living reality by the decisions reached on such *Aḥādīth* in respect of a thousand and one religions and worldly matters. There is, however, one condition governing the authenticity of such a *ḥadīth*: the narrator must be a person of unimpeachable integrity and no blemish should have accompanied his memory or sense of justice.

(ii) Double Narrative (*Khabar-i-'azīz*)—The second form of *Ḥadīth* is narrated by two reliable and just persons. Whatever the number of narrators in the intermediate link of the transmissional chain, it would, all the same, be counted as having been based on two narrators. The authenticity of such *Ḥadīth* in point of ***Sanad*** (authority) would obviously be greater than that of the first kind *vis-a-vis* the probability of which it is all the more probable and would carry greater authority in respect of affairs. The *muḥaddithīn* call such a *ḥadīth* the *khabar-i-'azīz*.

(iii) The Reputed Narrative (*Khabar-i-mashhūr*)—This is the third kind of *Ḥadīth*. It must have been narrated by at least three unimpeachable persons from beginning to end. Even though the number of narrators in the transmissional chain might increase further on, the authorities shall be counted as three all the same. Such a narrative should be far more strong than the second and considered of utmost authority in respect of affairs. The denial of such a *ḥadīth* is sheer obstinacy in maintaining error and flagrant negation of truth. Such a report will not only raise a high degree of presumption but in a large measure, amount to certainty. Although legally it will not have the property of unequivocal and absolute certainty, yet in the common run of affairs there can be no question as to its certitude. The *muḥaddithīn* call it *khabar-i-mashhūr* in their terminology.

(iv) The Continuous Narrative (*Khabar-i-mutawātir*)—The fourth form of narration is that in which the number of narrators is not restricted to three or four persons only of unimpeachable integrity but from beginning to end there are so many narrators that it would be naturally impossible that they should have agreed upon a false report. The narrators of such a *ḥadīth* should never have been less than four in number at any time and could have been possibly more, with no delimitation as to number. This kind of narration obviously would be far more reliable and would stretch to the utmost limits of certainty. It would not only be generally of greater authority than the third variety, but in common parlance and legally also would command certainty. Its repudiation is, under no circumstances, permissible; on the contrary, it is endued with conclusive authority. In the terminology of the *muḥaddithīn* it is called the *khabar-i-mutawātir*.

Continuous Narration: Kinds and Grades

If the continuous narrations do not remain confined to a few individuals but pass on to large groups of peoples so far so that hosts of men join the rank of narrators, then the strength of continuity is reinforced. Still continuity as a class will remain the same. The late 'Allāmah Anwar Shāh suggested two names for such *ḥadīth*. The first is *tawātur-i-sanadī*, that is, uninterrupted chain of authority; the second is *tawātur-i-qarnī* (perennial continuity). The narrative of the Qur'ān belongs to the second kind. In the event, continuous narration is not open to question at all. Did anyone deny or negate a *ḥadīth* based on such certitude and sound evidence, he would be nothing short of being out of his mind. Since this would be, as it were, the voice of God articulated in the voice of people, the narration would be *ipso facto* a transmission from God. There is no principle by which such a narration could be refuted as God Himself is its Guardian and not His creatures.

Rationally, therefore, only these four kinds of narration can be established. The larger the number of narrators, the more strong and firm will be the *ḥadīth*, with corresponding increase in authenticity and authority. In other words, the more a narration passes from the individual to a company, the more does it pass from presumption to conviction and from certitude to absolute certainty. Evidently, the *Sharī'ah* has admitted two persons as constituting company;

Two and above constitute company.
اَلْاِثْنَانِ وَمَا فَوْقَهُمَا جَمَاعَةٌ۔

Therefore even if two persons happen to pray together they would, according to the *Sharī'ah*, form a congregation. An assembly of three persons will be a group. Hence a group comprising three persons is deemed considerable according to the *Sharī'ah*. If the number exceeds three, it will become an assembly. Such a gathering is entitled to offer Friday prayers, the purpose of which is religious communion and gathering together as is evident from the word *Jum'ah* itself and its root *Jama'* (collecting). If a large body comprises people, each of whom stands as a paradigm of integrity and truthfulness, that is, he is by himself a community, in accordance with the *āyah*: "ان ابراهيم كان آمة" "Indeed, Ibrāhīm was by himself an *ummah*," then this body would constitute a major body whose words shall be considered to have reached the very acme of certainty and credibility, more credible than which is not within the range of possibility. Not only figuratively but naturally, as a matter of course, the hearts of the believers would be comforted and soothed by what this body says.

Thus what we denote as congregation commences with more than one person and reaches upto four. A greater number than this means enhancement of its magnitude, not what constitutes it. The plurality of narrators required in the authority of a narrator to create reliability, credence, satisfaction and confidence is, therefore, satisfied when the number of narrators is at least four.

Beyond that there is a gradual addition in credence and assurance; the basis of certitude will remain four provided the narrators are just and reliable. Thus our analytical approach yields four kinds of *Aḥādīth* called *khabar-i-gharīb*, *khabar-i-'azīz*, *khabar-i-mashhūr* and *khabar-i-mutawātir* by the *muḥaddithīn*.

Continuous Narration and its Authoritativeness

The Qur'ān as a matter of fact has itself not only established the position of the Tradition as a genre, but also laid the basis of four kinds of *Aḥādīth*. This is a living proof of the uninterrupted narration by which it has been preserved and transmitted to us from the Prophet's times. In other words, the mode in which the Qur'ān was revealed testifies the fact of *tawātur*, the denial of which would be like denying the identity of the Qur'ān itself. Evidently, anyone who acknowledges the Qur'ān on the basis of uninterrupted narration, shall have to admit continuous narration of *Ḥadīth* and its authoritativeness also, failing which he shall have to part company with the authority of the Qur'ān too, since the continuous narrative which has established the authority of the Qur'ān constitutes the backbone of the continuous *Ḥadīth* also. There is thus no reason why the uninterrupted narrative should not be regarded as absolute proof for it. There is no reason, if the causal element is the same in both, that the conclusion with regard to them should be different. It is true that the continuous narration of the Qur'ān is infinitely high; it is called perennial continuity which the ordinary type of continuous narration cannot vie with. But the difference, at the most will be one of degree and can not mean the denial of continuous narration itself. If the continuity of the revelation of the Qur'ān begets the height of certainty, which is of higher order, then, the continuity of *Ḥadīth* would *ipso facto* breed nothing but certainty, not that continuous narration would become unworthy of credence. Thus the outcome of extreme perfection of continuous narration is certitude, not the denial of such narration and its product—certainty.

Those who, keeping in view the most exalted form of the continuous narrative as exemplified by the Qur'ān, negate the continuity of *Aḥādīth*, do in fact deny the continuity of revelation of the Qur'ān itself, or else they are false in denying continuous *Aḥādīth*. Since the highest degree of continuous narration contains the category of such narration itself, the height of certainty undoubtedly contains the factum of certainty also. The nature of highest type of continuous narration, therefore, is nothing more than the intensification of the primary narration. What else is this highest certainty than that the primary certitude should be enhanced. No one can reach the magnified quantum without passing through the primary one. Anyone, therefore, who believes in the intensive form automatically believes in the original element also which is comprised in it.

Thus, the denial of the original, keeping in view what is superogatory, in fact, constitutes the denial of the addition also. Otherwise, how did the addition come into being without the original and how did the person denying it, come by the addition? If he still persists in his negation, he would be like one who thinks he can inhabit the upper storey of a house after the lower one has been razed to the ground. Therefore, just as such a person would be considered false, similarly, he who denies the continuous narrative of the *Aḥādīth* having fully accepted the uninterrupted narration of the Qur'ān, would be considered false as the latter is a perfect instance of the enhanced mode of continuity. It is but the continuous narration of the continuous *Aḥādīth* which has appeared in a heightened form in the sublime continuous narration of the Qur'ān. In short, the Qur'ān itself and its narration are proof positive of the continuous narration and its authoritativeness.

The Narrative Mode of the Qur'an

Not only this; in fact, the narrative of the Qur'ān not only provides evidence for continuous narrative but also proof for the reliability of narration and reporting pure and simple, because the narration of the Qur'ān is but a species of continuous narration, which is but a variety of narration, that is to say, narration and report are in the nature of genus and continuous narration is just one variety thereof. Evidently, to deny a thing divided after admitting its division, or to consider the former unreliable after admitting the latter as reliable, is just like denying the absolute after admitting the finite or the general after accepting the particular, although the finite cannot exist without the absolute and the particular without the general. For this reason, when one acknowledges the special type of narrative of the Qur'ān, that is, continuous narrative, one cannot escape affirming the absolute type of narrative, since this is contained in the particular one. The continuous narrative, once conceded as reliable, will naturally lead one to accept narrative also because the acknowledgement of one is the acknowledgement of the other. Therefore, the narrative mode of the Qur'ān provides a proof not only for the continuous narrative which is but a kind thereof but also of the credence of the absolute report which is the thing divided. This would imply that in principle narration is without doubt worthy of credence and reliable along with the different kinds thereof, according to their respective nature, whether Qur'ānic or non-Qur'ānic. Therefore, having acknowledged credence of the Qur'ānic narrative it becomes necessary to admit the credence of the narrative of *Ḥadīth* also, although their comparative position and the difference in rank of their behests cannot be denied, nor is it possible to deny the bedrock of both—continuity of narration.

Two Alternatives for the Negators of *Ḥadīth*

There are only two alternatives for those who negate *Ḥadīth*: they should deny transmission and narration out and out and openly deny the Qur'ān alongwith the *Ḥadīth*, but if they believe in the narration of the Qur'ān, then they must admit the narration of the *Ḥadīth* as well in view of their having admitted narration as a verity. They cannot accept the Qur'ān and negate the *Ḥadīth*, otherwise they would be considered deniers of the narrative itself. Further consideration would amply show that the proof for continuous narrative does not rest merely upon the fact of continuity of narration of the Qur'ān but is provided by the proof of the Qur'ān itself. It is not necessary that its proof should be sought in the continuous narration of the Qur'ān alone, since once the Qur'ān is admitted as gospel truth, the question naturally arises, how did we come to know that this Qur'ān is the very Qur'ān that was revealed? If we came to know it from the Qur'ān which has not yet been proved as such, then how can it provide proof for anything else? This is called: "تقدم الشی علی نفسه" "presuming a thing before it comes into existence", a sort of *a posteriori* approach. Thus we can know it is the self-same Qur'ān through an extraneous source, and what else can this source be but the reports regarding the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) which were recorded and have reached us intact ? This is what is called the *Ḥadīth*. Therefore, proving that the Qur'ān is verily the Qur'ān depends upon the *Ḥadīth*.

Considered this way, could it be possible that the acknowledgement of the Qur'ān should be made imperative but not that of the *Ḥadīth*? If this is so, then it would not be possible to prove and establish the very existence of the Qur'ān.

Absoluteness of Uninterrupted Narrative Established from the Absoluteness of the Qur'an

A report which conveys to us knowledge of such a definite, indubitable and most important book like the Qur'ān should similarly be absolutely definite. If it remains uncertain, then obviously the proof of the Qur'ān will also be not definite but conjectural, and denial thereof would lead us to heresy. In such event, belief in the Qur'ān will also not remain absolutely obligatory and the entire structure of the faith will be doomed to destruction. This report must perforce be definite and extremely convincing, and no report except that based on continuous narrative can be so. Hence before proving the Qur'ān even though in its own context, not only is the identity of *Ḥadīth* proved, as the relation between the narration of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* is that of genus and species, but the proof of the special kind of the *Ḥadīth* known as continuous *Ḥadīth* is also obtained. Anyone who believes in the Qur'ān, therefore, cannot deny the existence of the *Ḥadīth* and its offshoot, continuous narrative, failing which he would be regarded as a liar and hypocrite in his admission of faith in the Qur'ān. If, however, anyone denies the Qur'ān itself, we do not propose to argue with him here, for he has to be answered in a different manner.

Thus in whatever way we acknowledge the Qur'ān, it would be essential to acknowledge, at least, the *Aḥādīth* of continuous form for which the narration of the Qur'ān too is a standing proof, and even a standing proof for the acknowledgement of the Qur'ān itself, so that the proof of the one automatically leads to the proof of the other. Thus, incidentally, we get proof for continuous narration from the Qur'ān itself.

The Mashhur, 'Aziz and Gharib in the Light of the Qur'an

Let us now consider the three remaining kinds of reports—the *mashhūr*, '*azīz*, and *gharīb*, in the context of the Qur'ān. The proof of the report known as the *mashhūr*, comprising three reports of unquestioned antecedents, and its authority also can be obtained from the Qur'ān. Describing the *Aṣḥāb al-Qaryah* (people of the city), the Qur'ān says:

وَاضْرِبْ لَهُمْ مَّثَلًا اَصْحٰبَ الْقَرْيَةِ اِذْ
جَآءَهَا الْمُرْسَلُوْنَ ○ اِذْ اَرْسَلْنَآ اِلَيْهِمُ اثْنَيْنِ
فَكَذَّبُوْهُمَا فَعَزَّزْنَا بِثَالِثٍ فَقَالُوْٓا اِنَّآ اِلَيْكُمْ
مُّرْسَلُوْنَ ○ یٰسین آیت ۱۳-۱۴

Coin for them a similitude: The people of the city when those sent (from Allāh) came unto them; When We sent unto them twain, and they denied them both, so We reinforced them with a third, and they said: Lo! we have been sent unto you.

(Qur'ān, 36:13-14)

This incident pertains to the people of Antioch and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was directed to relate it to his *ummah* in order to make it understand the nature of Divine Messengers.

It will be evident from the foregoing that, after two prophets had been denied, a third one was added because it is against human nature to negate three trustworthy and just persons; and it would form a conclusive testimony against the inhabitants of the city. An assembly of three persons forms a *jamā'at* and it is but natural to assume that a party of three persons—and that too comprising truthful and pious persons—cannot lie nor can it be belied. Evidently, the crucial thing here is the number three with regard to narration and transmission, not the nature of prophethood because even one prophet exceeds the whole world in the qualities of trustworthiness, justice, truthfulness, and honesty. If the people of the city had held prophethood in reverence, they could not have dared to belie even one of those messengers. Had they done so, they themselves would have been charged with unreliability. It would not have been necessary to add to the number of the messengers as regards their apostolic capacity. But, since proof positive had to be provided, three completed the tale to convey the message to them. It will, therefore, be clear that, on the generally accepted principle, the evidence offered by three persons whose integrity stands unquestioned and duly vouched for, cannot be considered refutable.

This establishes the principle that if a report reaches us through the statements of three persons of reliable and unquestioned antecedents, then, according to the Qur'ān, it cannot be rejected because such a testimony crosses the bounds of probability and passes into certainty, leaving no scope for doubt. And since *khabar-i-mashhūr* is of this very nature, proof is furnished for it and its authoritative stance from the Qur'ān itself. That being so, he who negates the verity and authority of *khabar-i-mashhūr*, in fact, denies the aforesaid principle of the Qur'ān and the *āyah* which has been just quoted.

Similarly *khabar-i-'azīz*, which is reported by two persons of integrity, is confirmed by the Qur'ān and carries authority for all relevant matters :

وَأَشْهِدُوا ذَوَىْ عَدْلٍ مِّنكُمْ وَأَقِيمُوا
الشَّهَادَةَ لِلَّهِ الطلاق آيت ۲

And call to witness two just men among you, and keep your testimony upright for Allāh. (Qur'ān, 65:2)

This shows that the evidence of two persons is not only trustworthy but also authoritative and governs decisions in innumerable matters pertaining to life and property as well as social and moral affairs, so much so that the verdict of a *qāḍī* becomes operative externally and internally. Such testimony is obviously in the nature of a *riwāyat* (narration) and has been named as such simply for the sake of identity because it can be presented before a judge, magistrate, arbitrator or judicial authority. This is what confers upon it an official character, otherwise it is the same ordinary narration outside the court. Evidently, if by reason of designation or association, a report is official or private, judicial or non-judicial, it makes no difference as to the nature of the report. If the same deponent makes the same statement out of the courtroom in public, there would be no difference at all except in terminology and relative meanings. Now it would only be called narration instead of testimony, but the character of the report and reporter would remain the same as in the courtroom. Thus all the conditions of testimony are in reality the same as those of plain narration. Therefore, just as in indirect evidence it is conditional that the reporter must be an eye-witness so that he makes a report on what he has seen or heard, similarly it is necessary that the first reporter should record the incident as he has seen or heard it. Then, just as the report may be indirect, a testimony may be indirect also. This is called *shahādat 'alā al-shahādat* (testimony upon testimony). And just as for the testimony of intermediate narrators, it is necessary that the last link in the chain should be a direct witness, similarly in the report of a narrative it is essential that the first reporter should have recorded what he has himself seen or heard. Then the conditions of integrity and reliability which are necessary for a *shāhid* (witness) are also necessary for a *rāwī* (reporter or narrator), the details of which have been systematized in the relevant science. Thus evidence and report are one and the same thing and, if evidence is juristically admitted as authoritative, then, undoubtedly, the narration also carries similar authority. The question is only of the report being legal or not, and not of the report *per se*.

Thus the fact that the Qur'ān, in the above *āyah*, has admitted the testimony of two persons as reliable and proof positive, means, in reality, proclaiming the same about *riwāyat* (narration). Hence if the evidence offered by two persons is admitted in so important an institution as the court of law which carries political importance as well, then why should it not be worthy, in an equal measure, of being admitted outside the court in public, where it carries no such political importance even ? This must needs be so. In fact, it should be highly reliable authority. Therefore, the Qur'ān itself turns out to be the source of the narration by two persons, formally known as *khabar-i-'azīz*, being reliable and peremptorily acknowledgeable. The negation of *khabar-i-'azīz* and its authoritativeness, therefore, negates the above *āyāh* and, consequently, the Qur'ān. As for the *khabar-i-gharīb*, also called *khabar-i-fard* (an individual's narration), based on the report of one man, it can be proved through the invocation of not one but numerous *āyāt* of the Qur'ān.

Dependence of Every Religion on One Person Only

The very fact that the *waḥī* was made to descend on all the prophets through the medium of Jibra'īl alone and all divine messages were transmitted by him, establishes the identity of the individual report, as it was a report by one person only. Lastly Jibra'īl narrated the whole Qur'ān to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Was it anything but an individual's report? God Almighty Himself says :

That this is indeed the speech of an illustrious messenger. (Qur'ān, 69:40)

إِنَّهٗ لَقَوْلُ رَسُوْلٍ كَرِيْمٍ ۝ الحآقّة آيت ٤٠

This would show the first narrator of the Qur'ānic text to have been the angel Jibra'īl, who alone conveyed the whole Qur'ān to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). It has been made explicit in the above *āyah* that this narration was by Jibra'īl and also the fact that the individual narrative of the Qur'ān has been declared as acknowledgeable, not because an angel narrated it but because Jibra'īl embodied in himself all the attributes that an unimpeachable person who narrates a report should have and who is free from all the negative traits of an unreliable narrator, as should be evident from the ascription of an attribute like 'illustrious' to Jibra'īl, a point which will be elaborated later.

In any case, whatever celestial attributes this august narrator might possess, the report by him will, nevertheless, be that of an individual only. This shows that the identity of the *khabar-i-gharīb* and its authoritativeness also stand proven by the categorical verses of the Qur'ān. This is especially so, since such reports are not confined to the Holy Prophet's time alone, but had been operative from the time of the Prophet Ādam (عليه السلام) down to that of the last of the Prophets—the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). This not only furnishes proof of the individual report but its importance also, for the foundations of all religions and *sharī'ahs* have been laid on it. Evidently in the early stages of religions, neither *khabar-i-'azīz* nor *khabar-i-mashhūr* and *khabar-i-mutawātir* possess such importance. Whether, therefore, any other kind of narration should be considered reliable or not, the individual report has to be endowed with this importance, otherwise, God forbid, the very basis of all religions and *sharī'ahs* would be destroyed.

An objection might be raised here that the matter under consideration is that of human beings but we are bringing in angels to illustrate the individual report, although in such cases the example of individuals of the same species would be plausible; in the present case, there is no similarity in kind between man and angel. How, then, can the instance of one species hold good for another ? This argument does not carry any weight for the nature of the narrative is one and the same, independent of the different kinds of beings involved. The difference lies only in the class of narrators and not that of narration. The narration and its qualities are in both cases the same. Therefore, the difference in the class of narrators does not vitiate the quality of a narration. It is just like the same statement being made by one person from China and another from Arabia; one from the East and another from the West. But when they have put down something, in accordance with the established principles of statement, what difference can their external characteristics—colour, appearance and so on—make in the nature of the statement? Similarly, if any persons, whether heavenly beings or earthly, make statements, according to the principles of narration, where lies the difficulty in presenting them as illustrative instances for human beings? Moreover, the angels are, in any case, the source of noble qualities and human beings have to make use of their beatific qualities. Evidently what is desired is not that man should become an angel but that he should aim at acquiring angelic virtues despite his belonging to a different kind of beings. This is not only possible but a fact. When, therefore, we say that such and such a person is angelic, we mean that in point of moral excellence, instances of angelic attributes can be cited in the case of human beings. If there can be this community of excellences between angels and human beings, despite difference in kinds, then why should the angelic excellence of narration be regarded as untenable insofar as human narrative is concerned? The objection raised, therefore, does not stand to reason.

There Came A Prophet To Every People

Anyway, leaving aside this argument, since the object is to convince the readers about the individual narration, we present a human instance instead of an angelic one from the Qur'ān itself. Earlier, we had the occasion to furnish proof for the *khabar-i-mashhūr* (reputed narration) from the Holy Qur'ān by arguing from the cumulative report of three prophets. Therefore, it should surely be enough proof for the *khabar-i-fard* (individual report) that it is based on the report of one prophet only. Who does not know that whatever report an *ummah* receives from a prophet consists of a solo report only? It was only in the case of the *Aṣḥāb al-Qaryah* that three prophets were sent at a time who collectively conveyed the message of God to them. Otherwise for each *ummah* only one Prophet and warner was sent who conveyed God's message to it. The Prophets Nūh (Noah), Ibrāhīm (Abraham), Mūsā (Moses), 'Īsā (Jesus), Hūd (Hod), and *Ṣāliḥ* (عليهم السلام) were commissioned as prophets to their respective *ummahs* individually, and each one of them transmitted God's message to it. What else was it if not an individual report?

Therefore, whenever the Qur'ān mentions the mission of Prophets, it relates to an individual report only. Wherever the expressions "and so said Noah (Nūḥ) (عليه السلام)", "and so said Hod (Ḥūd) (عليه السلام)", "and so said Lot (Lūṭ) (عليه السلام)" have occurred—and they were all categorical proofs—then surely they were very strong proof of the authoritative and unquestionable character of individual report. Such proofs are found in numerous verses of the Holy Qur'ān. Whereas we can find only an *āyah* or so in support of the *khabar-i-'azīz*, *khabar-i-mashhūr*, and the *khabar-i-mutawātir*, there are hundreds of *āyāt* pertaining to the individual report, which makes its proof more strong and unshakable than all others. And when all the divine reports proceed from one person alone to all, from angels down to prophets, then one cannot help concluding that all divine faiths and *sharī'ahs* rest upon individual report, not *khabar-i-mashhūr* and *mutawātir*. Considered thus, this kind of narrative acquires precedence over all other categories of narrative. It becomes all the more essential to subscribe to it as constituting the basis for all religions. Its negation would result in the collapse of all *sharī'ahs*. It is perhaps for this reason that the Qur'ān has furnished proof for it in one *āyah* after another. The number of such *āyāt* run into hundreds. Therefore, holding belief in the *khabar-i-fard* is more essential and obligatory than in the others.

In fact, looked at closely, these individual reports and narrations of the prophets not only furnish proof of individual report established as a category but as something said by the prophet its being a veritable reality and authority is also established, for the reports of the prophets of old were not only individual reports but prophetic utterances also, because in the particular type of revelation known as *khafī* (covert), the infusion in the mind of prophets was by God but the expression was their own. As against this, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was the only prophet who had the unique distinction in respect of the *Ḥadīth-i-Qudsī* (direct revelation in which both the contents and words were revealed by God). Thus the revelatory messages of *khafī* type by the former prophets were not really equivalent to *Ḥadīth-i-Qudsī*[1] of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Thus the testimony in favour of *khabar-i-fard* is provided not only by the Qur'ān but by the *Ḥadīth-i-Qudsī* too. By reason of the individual reports of the prophets, we not only get proof of the *khabar-i-fard* from the Qur'ān but that of the authority of that type of *Ḥadīth* also which has reached the *ummah* through one person only.

---

[1] *Jalī* (overt) revelation is one in which the content and words are both revealed. Revelation is made to all prophets in both these ways : *Jalī* and *khafī*, but in the case of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) even some *Aḥādīth* were revealed in content and expression. These are called *Ḥadīth-i-Qudsī*.

Thus what else were all such reports, except the Qur'ān, received from the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) by the Companions but *khabar-i-fard* (individual report)? Later on, corresponding to the lesser or greater number of narrators, the reports came to be known as *mashhūr* and *mutawātir*, but in the beginning they were just individual narrations. Thus the *khabar-i-fard* emerges from the *Nuṣuṣ* of the Qur'ān with varied types of proof.

Report of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is Adduction according to the Principles of Narration

In connection with the individual report received through a prophet's single report, the same mis-apprehension might arise as it did in the case of the angel Jibra'īl, that since the personality of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is an extraordinary one, it naturally overawes the minds of people; it matters little whether the messenger is an angel or a prophet; the acknowledgement of the report arises from the awe and majesty of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and not by the application of principles derived determining veracity; nor is it established by inductive principles from the Qur'ān. In other words, like the report of the angelic Messenger that of the human Messenger is also not an individual report established by due principles and criteria that one should acknowledge it as proved by the Qur'ān because of such similitudes. Even this view springs from ignorance of the Qur'ān and not reflecting deeply upon it. At no place has the Qur'ān tried to impose the admission of individual report upon the people on the basis of the weight and prestige of prophethood but has sought its admission on the basis of recognised principles of narration and scientific criteria only. Therefore, wherever the Holy Prophet's individual report has been affirmed by the Qur'ān, it has not been done on the basis of prophethood as such but on the basis of the principles of narration. God has Himself said :

> By the Star when it setteth, Your comrade erreth not, nor is deceived; Nor doth he speak of (his own) desire. It is naught save an inspiration that is inspired.
> (Qur'ān, 53:1-4)

> وَالنَّجْمِ إِذَا هَوٰى مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ
> وَمَا غَوٰى وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوٰى إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا
> وَحْيٌ يُّوْحٰى۔ (النجم آيات ۱-۴)

It should be quite clear that this individual report reached the *ummah* through the single person of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). The Qur'ān adjudged it as worthy of absolute credence, not because of Muḥammad (صلی الله علیه وسلم) being a prophet and Messenger but by pointing out that its relater is free from blemish and such disqualifications as would make his report incredible. Therefore, first of all, the disqualifying qualities were negatived and the prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was not called the *Rasūl* (Messenger) but *Ṣāhibukum* (Your comrade) which shows that it was not intended that pressure of prophethood should be exerted in forcing the acceptance of the individual report. Thus, in the first place, the foremost of these disqualifying factors—misguidance—was negatived because the words of the misguided and ignorant are not worthy of trust at all. Then inanity and obtuseness were negatived, for the report of a dull, crazy and perverse person can never command respect and confidence. Thirdly, the uncontrolled appetitive impulses have been ruled out because one who is a prey to these is selfish, and a selfish man's words being tainted cannot inspire faith and credence. These are the foibles that vitiate the validity of narration. Last of all, having pointed out these disqualifications, the condition quashing them was indicated, namely that the narrator is the bearer of *waḥī*, and such a person cannot be any other than a prophet because the station of a prophet and messenger is so exalted that deviation, error and selfishness are wholly foreign to it. Thus, in the first place, the function of prophethood has not been explicitly mentioned at all and even if alluded to by using the word *waḥī*, it is not expressly with regard to prophethood but simply for representation of positive qualities corresponding to the negative ones, thereby indicating that error, delusion, and selfishness cannot find their way into the personality of a man embodying *waḥī* (revelation) and prophethood, as these are the characteristics that make a report untrustworthy. Thus it becomes clear that no pressure whatsoever is being exerted to have the reliability and authority of individual report subscribed to by force of prophethood, but its credence is being declared obligatory so that it should become clear that a prophet's report is trustworthy both as regards proof and authority, even apart from the fact of being a prophet, because it comes upto the standard of narration and is free from shortcomings which make the narration fit for rejection. This has been done to make it absolutely clear that a prophet's report is worthy of trust and possesses full proof and authority even in accordance with the principles of narration, apart from the consideration of prophethood. It is evident that this intimation of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) whose *nuṭq* (utterance) has been mentioned in the above *āyah* is an individual report. So we get a positive proof of the entity of individual report from the Qur'ān in accordance with the principles of reporting.

Proof of entity of Individual Report from Non-Prophets

If one still persists in saying that the Holy Prophet's personality was an extraordinary one and therefore stood on a special footing, and that the proof of reports by ordinary persons can be furnished from instances of reports by ordinary persons only, and not those of extraordinary ones, I would say that the Holy Qur'ān has shed light on this also and the proof of the *khabar-i-fard* can be found even in the reports of non-prophets contained in its pages. For instance,

And a man came from the uttermost part of the city, running. He said: O Moses! Lo! the chiefs take counsel against thee to slay thee; therefore escape. Lo! I am of those who give thee good advice. So he escaped from thence, fearing, vigilant. (Qur'ān, 28:20-21)

وَجَآءَ رَجُلٌ مِّنْ أَقْصَا الْمَدِينَةِ يَسْعَىٰ قَالَ
يَٰمُوسَىٰٓ إِنَّ الْمَلَأَ يَأْتَمِرُونَ بِكَ لِيَقْتُلُوكَ فَاخْرُجْ
إِنِّي لَكَ مِنَ النَّٰصِحِينَ فَخَرَجَ مِنْهَا خَآئِفًا يَتَرَقَّبُ

It is obvious that the man who carried the report to the Prophet Moses (عليه السلام) was an ordinary person, and Moses (عليه السلام) believed him, which was but the report by one man and not many. Mentally Moses (عليه السلام) accepted its effect in the form of fear and physically in his going "فخرج منها خائفاً" (So he escaped from thence, fearing). The Prophet Moses (عليه السلام) accepted the information as fully true and was affected by it as he felt that the reporter had nothing in him that would tell upon his credibility. And the reporter himself supported his statement by saying: "انی لک من الناصحين" "I am of those who give thee good advice." The inference drawn from this statement is that the reporter was emphasizing the fact that he was not influenced by personal desire or was bluffing on someone's instigation but because he was a well-wisher of the Prophet and had come to inform him out of sincerity. This shows that the greatest attribute of a narrator is that he should have no ulterior motives so that his sincerity should make the report authentic. Thus, if an ordinary person comes to a prophet and he not only takes him at his word but acts upon his advice, then what greater and more valid proof could be forthcoming with regard to the authoritative nature of the *khabar-i-fard*? And this too despite the fact that the probity and veracity of a non-prophet are nothing beside those of a prophet. A drop stands no comparison with the ocean; nevertheless the report of a non-prophet was acknowledged as correct because the reporter was relating something that was strictly in accordance with the principles of narration; he was neither tainted nor motivated by any ulterior purpose, and was not led by any venal desire. The proof of the individual narrative has been provided by the Qur'ān not in one but so many ways. Instances have been presented from the angels, the prophets, and non-prophets. This shows that the Qur'ān has been very meticulous about proving this type of information, as if, against the negators of the *Ḥadīth*, the Qur'ān has emphasized all the while that kind of narration which the negators of the *Ḥadīth* particularly evade, that is the individual narration which they do not consider worthy of any attention whatsoever. Even if they do acknowledge anything it is the *khabar-i-mutawātir* (continuous narration) in support of which the Qur'ān has not presented any specific *āyah* itself. This shows that the negators of the *Ḥadīth* are in fact not only the negators of the Qur'ān but its enemies also, and this too that the Qur'ān is their enemy and shuns them. Were they bent upon obliterating the individual narration altogether, the Qur'ān supported it through its array of continuous *āyāt*, and if they wanted that only continuous narration should be accepted, the Qur'ān has not devoted much attention to prove it. Thus individual report has some special importance in respect of narration, towards which the Qur'ān has drawn attention in many ways.

The Report of Evil-liver : Not Rejected Altogether

The Qur'ān has not only given examples in support of the *khabar-i-fard* from the angels, prophets, and common people but, going further, or still more, going down the ladder, accepted individual reports by evil-livers also, subject to the condition of corroboration and investigation. Accordingly, God has said :

يَٰٓأَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْٓا اِنْ جَآءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌۢ بِنَبَاٍ
فَتَبَيَّنُوْٓا اَنْ تُصِيْبُوْا قَوْمًۢا بِجَهَالَةٍ فَتُصْبِحُوْا عَلٰى
مَا فَعَلْتُمْ نٰدِمِيْنَ۔ الحجرات آیت ۶

O ye who believe ! If an evil-liver bring you tidings, verify it, lest ye smite some folk in ignorance and afterward repent of what ye did. (Qur'ān, 49:6)

This shows that even the report of an evil-living person can be reliable and enjoy veracity, provided it is duly established. It can serve as testimony even in such important affairs as would make one ashamed on their going wrong, which is always the case in important affairs. The nett result of all this is that the report of a single person is, according to the principles laid down in the Qur'ān, not fit for rejection or unreliable but after due scrutiny and investigation can be depended upon and prove testimony in big affairs, which, in common practice, leads to decision thereof. Restraint has only been laid upon acting on a report before investigation but not in absolute terms; otherwise God would have said in clear words that if an unreliable person brings you any news do not believe him at all, not that it should be accepted and considered reliable after investigation. The condition for inquiry was laid so that the elements of unreliability which had crept into the information because of the evil-living of the reporter, should be eliminated and the information should become reliable.

The news, nevertheless, will remain that of a single person. This proves beyond any doubt that the report of one person is reliable and carries evidential value in human affairs. If the narrator is not a *fāsiq* (evil-liver) but blameless, such as the one who informed the Prophet Moses (عليه السلام) about the plot being hatched against him, then news even without verification can be acceptable on this principle. And, should the narrator, besides being blameless, be just, pious, honest and trustworthy, as is the case with the angels, prophets and righteous persons, then, according to this principle, such a direct report does not need any verification and investigation at all. Even if the report has to be sifted because of intermediate links, this is resorted to, when it becomes all the more reliable. All the same, this report must remain a report by a single person. Therefore, *khabar-i-fard*, which is also called *khabar-i-gharīb*, would, according to the Qur'ān, be reliable and proof positive, although its verity would remain a matter of surmise which is also held valid by the *Sharī'ah* and has a legal bearing upon day-to-day affairs. Surmises are not mere fancies but that despite credence of a report there should remain scope for the possibility of the contrary also, not that the original report should become untrustworthy and fit for rejection. However, if alongside this, thorough investigation is made with regard to that narrator who is just and trustworthy, that is, authentic particulars, strengthening factors, evidences and corelates of the report are also accumulated, then the element of surmise can be eliminated from an individual report to such an extent that it would reach the limit of conviction and, if such a report does not lead to the point of absolute certainty, it would surely reach the point of quasi-certainty which, in the terminology of the science of Tradition, is known as *ghalbah-i-ẓann* (strong probability or strong surmise). Such a report then can neither be rejected nor considered unreliable according to established principles, especially when the Qur'ān does not hold even an evil-liver's report as totally untrustworthy; in fact, it considers it credible after proper verification. How, then, can the report of a trustworthy and honest man be rejected in the light of this principle of the Qur'ān? The individual report, therefore, and its verity are amply confirmed by the above *āyah* and it can be concluded that he who denies its authority denies all the relevant *āyāt* which undoubtedly means denial of the Qur'ān. Not only that, it means denial of all revealed books and narrations by angels and prophets. Heaven forfend!

However, when these four kinds of reports have been categorically proved to be fundamental and standard, then it logically follows that all other kinds of these four categories should stem from them and their verity *ipso facto* stands proved. The reason for this is that these four kinds of ***Aḥādīth***, as has been already discussed, are dependent upon the number of narrators, which ranges from one to four. The report by one narrator is *khabar-i-gharīb*, by two *khabar-i-'azīz*, by three *khabar-i-mashhūr*, and if the number goes beyond three and four and the word is passed by so many just and trustworthy persons whose agreement upon a false report is practically impossible, then it is called *khabar-i-mutawātir*. These four kinds constitute the basic kinds of the *Ḥadīth* as regards the number of narrators. If a Tradition has more than four narrators, it would be but a derivative of these basic kinds and that with less than one narrator shall be also one of these, for it would either be an addition to four persons or a substraction from them. In both cases all the other varieties shall remain bound up with these four by which this rise and fall in the number of narrators would be recognised. If, for instance, the number of narrators exceeds four and the report is maintained by all classes from top to bottom then it would be called continuous narration of all ranks, which marks the narration proper of the Qur'ān itself. Nevertheless, this type of report would be called a variety of the continuous narration, not an independent one apart from it, for the addition of a thing to another is a supplement which is subservient to and not separate from it—an independent category. Similarly, if, in the Traditions having one narrator only, the number falls short somewhere of one even, which makes the report *khabar-i-gharīb*, then, even if it be lesser in rank than the *gharīb* still it would be considered its offshoot. For instance if at the lower extreme of the *sanad* proximate to us, the number of narrators falls short by one, the *ḥadīth* shall be called *mu'allaq* (Inoperative); if at the upper extreme, that is the times of the Companions, it shall be designated as *mursal* (Operative), and if in between these two, then it would be called *mu'aḍḍal* (Interruptive). Nevertheless, all these shall be classed as offshoots of *khabar-i-gharīb*, as they all belong to the class of narrative by a single person in which the narrator falls short of even one on some occasions. Thus the kind of *Ḥadīth* arising from the number of narrators exceeding four would remain a variety of continuous narration, and the kind arising from the falling short of one narrator even would be a form of the *gharīb*. Therefore, the source of *gharīb* and *mutawātir* would also be the source of their derivations because they are not new varieties but the self-same *gharīb* and *mutawātir*. If any difference has arisen, it is in respect of their quality and impact only, due to increase or decrease in the number of narrators, not in respect of the nature of the narration itself, which remains as it was, the *mutawātir* or the *gharīb*. And when it has been proved earlier that the source of all these four kinds of reports lies in the Qur'ān, the source of these derivations must needs be the same because these are, with only a slight difference in property, exactly the original kind. Thus one can say without any hesitation whatsoever that all kinds of *Aḥādīth* arising from increase or decrease in the number of narrators stand proved by the Qur'ān because if their fundamentals are proved by it, then their derivatives are also established by it, especially when the latter are but the self-same basic categories; the difference is not of nature but of qualities and attributes.

Different Kinds of *Ḥadīth* According to the Attributes of Narrators

The Holy Qur'ān has not only shed light on the different basic kinds of *Ḥadīth* in relation to the number of the narrators; it has as well, furnished guidelines on their classification with respect to the attributes of the narrators, such that this classification shall serve as a criterion and standard for the remaining kinds of its categories also. The second kind of classification of the *Ḥadīth* thus relates to the virtuous qualities of the narrators. It isaccording to these that narrators are considered *thiqah* (trustworthy), *gha yr thiqah* (untrustworthy), *mu'tabar* (reliable), and *ghayr mu'tabar* (unreliable), and their grade, high or low, is determined. The bases of these virtues too have been determined by the Qur'ān just as the standard number of narrators for narration based on numerical strength was prescribed by it. The two qualifications which make a narrator acceptable are *'adālat* (correct judgment) and *ḍabṭ* (retentive memory). If the narrators are sound of judgment and have a strong memory, and along with it the chain of transmission is *musalsal*[1] and *muttaṣil* (consistent) then this narration will be called a *ḥadīth* intrinsically accurate (*Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*) which represents a very high type of narration in view of the attributes of the narrator because he possesses the highest degree of judgment and memory, the two attributes which make a narrator credible and trustworthy. A *ḥadīth* falling within this category will, therefore, be considered fundamental. All other types of narration arise from addition, alteration, accretion and diminution in respect of the requisite merits of the narrator. For this reason it would be a derivative thereof. For instance, if the narrator is devoid of the sense of right judgment, then this loss or deficiency will give rise to five basic defects called the *maṭā'in al-ḥadīth* (derogators of the Traditions)—namely, *kidhb* (falsehood), *tuhmat al-kidhb* (ascription of falsehood), *fisq* (evil-living), *jahālat* (ignorance), and *bid'at* (innovation). If a narrator is a liar, has been dubbed a liar, is an evil-liver or ignorant person, and happens to introduce his own innovations, then he will not be considered *'ādil* (sound of judgment) and his report cannot be given credence to.

Similarly, if the narrator does not possess a sound memory, then this aphasic condition will lead to five weaknesses that render his report unreliable: *farṭ-i-ghaflat* (excessive carelessness), *kathrat-i-ghalaṭ* (frequency of error), *mukhālifat-i-thiqāt* (contradicting the trustworthy), *wahm* (delusion), and *sūi-ḥifẓ* (poor memory). This means that if the narrator is negligent and careless ; he is not alert, cautious and intelligent; is prolific in mistakes and listless; says something new, contrary to what is said by trustworthy persons; is whimsical and doubtful about his own report; possesses a poor memory and is forgetful, then he will not be called strong in memory and retentiveness. Hence his report can not be worthy of credence. But there are degrees of these deficiencies in judgment and memory. If a *ḥadīth* suffers in a slight degree from weaknesses in these two respects but has been narrated from other sources and is supported by a large number of narrators, then it is called *Ṣaḥīḥ li-ghayrihī* (authentic despite its having this slight defect.) If it is not redeemed and these slight defects persist then such a *ḥadīth* would be called *Ḥasan li-dhātihī* (intrinsically good) and even if in such a state this defect is removed by the plurality of sources, the narration would be called the *Ḥasan li-ghayrihī* (good despite deficiency). The degree of reliability and credence of such *Aḥādīth* will be determined accordingly.

The Qur'an as the Basis of the *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*

There are thus four basic kinds of *Aḥādīth* according to the types of the narrators: the *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*, the *Ṣaḥīḥ li-ghayrihī*, the *Ḥasan li-dhātihī* and the *Ḥasan li-ghayrihī*. Of these the most fundamental is the *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī* which is the highest of its kind. The other three kinds—*khabar-i-gharīb*, *khabar-i-'azīz* and *khabar-i-mutawātir*—arise from some kind of deficiency. We have seen that the *mutawātir* kind is the basic type in narrations depending upon numerical strength, and any shortcoming or weakness in it gave rise to the other three kinds.

---

[1] This means that type of narration in which various reporters narrate with the same word or happen to be unanimous about a saying or act, which naturally results in consistency.

If in the three kinds of *Aḥādīth* which depend upon the merits of the narrators, any weakness in the derogators is aggravated, this will lead to still other sub-types of *Aḥādīth*, e.g. (i) *mawḍū'*, where the judgment is vitiated by falsehood; (ii) *matrūk*, where the narrator is stigmatized for falsehood; (iii) *mubham*, where the narrator is ignorant; (iv) *Shādh*, where the narrator cannot hold things fast—a defect which makes him liable to excessive carelessness, prolificness in error, or gainsaying the trusted; (v) *mu'allal*, where the narrator is victim to whims and attacks of oblivion, and (vi) *mukhtalaṭ*, where the narrator displays poor memory.

Looked at closely, all these sub-varieties will be found to arise from the three principal ones, nay, from the one basic kind only, namely, the *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*, because of the visitation of some kind of deficiency in different proportions and degrees. Hence all these would be called dichotomous branches of this kind which is the most perfect type. Therefore, the source of this one kind would be the source of all these—the Qur'ān. In fact, the source of this fundamental genre is the Qur'ān. In the first place, the narration of the Qur'ān itself is *par excellence Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*; for this reason too the source of it will prove to be the Qur'ān. It is again the Qur'ān which has established the criterion of the particular condition and merits of the *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*. Because of this too the Qur'ān is its fountain-head which has set the two fundamental determinants, judgment and retentiveness, as the prerequisites for accepting or rejecting narrations, and constitutes the very essence of the *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*, for the Qur'ān has set down these two basic virtues—judgment and retentiveness—among the credentials of the narrators for purposes of evidence. As mentioned earlier, testimony is, in fact, narration. Hence imposing the condition of judgment and retentiveness on the testifier is in fact imposing the condition on the narrators of an affair as well, as report is common to both. It is another thing, if *shahādat* (testification or witnessing) is a legal report, in which event the testifier should have these twin attributes to a very high degree, and if it is ordinary work-a-day narrative then variation in these qualifications is acceptable according to the nature of the affair. In any case, it is necessary that the narrator should have sound judgment and retentiveness. So the Qur'ān imposed the condition of sound judgment for testification in the court of law :

And call to witness two just men among you, and keep your testimony upright for Allāh. (Qur'ān, 65:2)

وَأَشْهِدُوا ذَوَىْ عَدْلٍ مِّنكُمْ وَأَقِيمُوا
الشَّهَادَةَ لِلَّهِ (الطلاق، آیت ۲)

From this *āyah* it follows that the standard for the acceptance of testification in the court of law is the same as that for accepting a report.

The second condition that the Qur'ān has postulated is that of sound memory and retentiveness, that is, the memory of the testifier should not be faulty, for which the express term is *ḍabṭ* (retentiveness) :

And call to witness, from among your men, two witnesses. And if two men be not (at hand), then a man and two women, of such as ye approve as witnesses, so that if the one erreth (through forgetfulness) the other will remember. (Qur'ān, 2:282)

وَاسْتَشْهِدُوا شَهِيدَيْنِ مِن رِّجَالِكُمْ
فَإِن لَّمْ يَكُونَا رَجُلَيْنِ فَرَجُلٌ وَامْرَأَتَانِ مِمَّن
تَرْضَوْنَ مِنَ الشُّهَدَاءِ أَن تَضِلَّ إِحْدَاهُمَا فَتُذَكِّرَ
إِحْدَاهُمَا الْأُخْرَىٰ (البقرہ آیت ۲۸۲)

The point to be considered here is that two women have been substituted for one man as witnesses. This restriction has been imposed because a woman has less contact with day-to-day affairs and also with the courts of law. The second woman has been kept as a stand-by so that she might remind the first in case the latter forgets so that no error should be committed in giving evidence and narrating an event, thereby upsetting the matter. It should be, therefore, clear that if a witness is prone towards forgetfulness or amnesia, his testification to a report shall be vitiated unless means are found to counteract his faltering memory. And, when the possibility that the narrator might forget detracts from the cogency of a report, then how can we trust a report in the event of its having been reported by a person suffering from lapse of memory? This provides us with the basic principle that, if the narrator or testifier is remiss or forgetful, or has an unsound memory, his testification would also be unworthy. We thus have been able to extract two basic principles which vitiate a *ḥadīth*: (1) Inequity, the opposite of equity, and (2) Forgetfulness, the converse of memory. A narrator having these negative characteristics will vitiate a report to that extent. For the rest the *āyah* has pointedly mentioned the provision of a corrective to women's forgetfulness. Not because for men forgetfulness in narrative is not reprehensible and is not derogatory to it, but because there is a strong presumption of forgetfulness in women, since they have, in normal course, seldom to do with the courts of law and their understanding of affairs is not of such high order that they should be reliable, resulting in the necessity of someone else's succour. Thus the mental make-up of a woman requires as it were, a prop. This distinction arises from a special situation and not variation in principle. Again, as the condition "ممن ترضون" "of such as you approve" has been imposed for men, which necessitates the approval of the witness by the seeker of evidence, and all too obviously the choice will fall upon a person not deficient in memory or blameworthy, hence if memory and retentiveness have been explicitly mentioned in respect of women, in the case of men the will of the person who selects witnesses has been stressed. Therefore according to this principle derived from this *āyah*, sharp retentiveness and sharp memory are necessary for testimony, and when testimony is but narration, for report and narration as well, irrespective of whether the reporter is a man or woman, and that forgetfulness and lack of retentiveness are a cause of negating or quashing credibility. Again, since sound judgment has already been postulated as essential for the reporter from the earlier *āyah* in the *Sūrah Al-Ṭalāq*—(65:2), by combining these two *āyāt*, we automatically reach the conclusion that on the Qur'ānic principle, only such testification shall be irrefutable and only such narrations shall be acceptable as shall have as their transmitters, persons who are sound in judgment and possess good retentiveness; they should not suffer from poor memory and unsound judgment. Such report or narrative, in the terminology of the science of the Tradition, is called the *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*, whether it is by one, two, three or more narrators. The *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī* narrative thus is basic with regard to the characteristics of the narrators, the foundation of which has been laid by Qur'ān, which has specifically indicated the attributes of the narrators as well.

Ten Weaknesses Explained by the Qur'an

Further consideration will show that the Qur'ān has not only highlighted these two basic qualities with regard to the narrator's or reporter's characteristics—namely, sound judgment and memory—but has also clearly pointed out the ten defects which arise from the absence of or deficiency in these. Thus, while describing the authority of the Qur'ān, God Almighty has shed light on the primary narrators in the transmissional chain, saying, the person narrating from God is the Angel Jibra'īl, while the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) reported from the latter. Casting light on this 'golden chain' and the attributes of its constituents the Qur'ān says:

> That this is in truth the word of an honoured messenger, mighty, established in the presence of the Lord of the Throne, (one) to be obeyed, and trustworthy; and your comrade is not mad. Surely he beheld him on the clear horizon. And he is not avid of the Unseen. Nor is this the utterance of a devil worthy to be stoned.
> (Qur'ān, 81:19-25)

إِنَّهُ لَقَوْلُ رَسُولٍ كَرِيمٍ ذِي قُوَّةٍ عِنْدَ ذِي
الْعَرْشِ مَكِينٍ مُطَاعٍ ثَمَّ أَمِينٍ وَمَا صَاحِبُكُمْ
بِمَجْنُونٍ وَلَقَدْ رَآهُ بِالْأُفُقِ الْمُبِينِ وَمَا هُوَ
عَلَى الْغَيْبِ بِضَنِينٍ وَمَا هُوَ بِقَوْلِ شَيْطَانٍ رَجِيمٍ

By '*Rasūlin Karīm*' is meant the Angel Jibra'īl, who transmitted the Qur'ān to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and read it out to him. Thus Jibra'īl is the first narrator. The Qur'ān has not said, since he is an angel, people should acknowledge his narration; that is, they should do so because of being overwhelmed by his majesty. What has been enjoined, on the other hand, is that his report should be acknowledged after being examined on the principles by which a narrative should be adjudged, and only then should it be considered acceptable. Hence out of all the attributes of the Angel Jibra'īl, only three especially pertain to the acceptability of a narrative: (i) that he is a Messenger, (ii) that he is beneficent and honoured, and (iii) he bears in trust (the report). All the ten characteristics that tell upon the correctness of a statement are dispelled by these three attributes. It is because of this that the narrative of the Angel Jibra'īl becomes acceptable, and not just because he happens to be an angel. Rightly considered, the reality of apostleship is knowledge, since it is its very foundation. Hence being a divine messenger, in fact, means possessing knowledge of God; the antithesis of knowledge is ignorance. Thus by the very fact that the Angel Jibra'īl has been called the Messenger, he has been winnowed of ignorance which constitutes one of the factors that negate the veracity of a statement, report, or narrative. Further, it is obvious that apostlehood is in fact the *sharī'ah* which renders subservience and surrender necessary:

> And now have We set thee (O Muḥammad) on a clear road of (Our) commandments; so follow it. (Qur'ān, 45:18)

ثُمَّ جَعَلْنَاكَ عَلَى شَرِيعَةٍ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ فَاتَّبِعْهَا
(الجاثیہ، آیت ۱۸)

Since a follower can never be an innovator, the defect of *bid'at* (innovation) is also removed by the word *risālat* or prophethood. Then an adjunct of ignorance is the anti-authoritative stance also for when a statement has been reported by several people of unimpeachable authority, then saying something counter to it, will not be acceptable as reality but its contrary, a figment of the narrator's own imagination. This is a species of ignorance, not of knowledge. The word *risālat*, therefore, negates not only ignorance but also the denial of the accredited authority. The attribute of apostlehood therefore negates three things derogatory to narration—ignorance, innovation, and the anti-authoritative approach.

The second attribute mentioned about the Angel Jibra'īl is that of his being honoured, for which, according to the following *āyah* of the Qur'ān, *taqwā* (piety) is necessary:

> Lo! the noblest of you, in the sight of Allāh, is the best in conduct.
> (Qur'ān, 49:13)

إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ أَتْقٰكُمْ (الحجرات آيت ١٣)

A *muttaqī* is a person who observes *taqwā* (piety). According to the Qur'ān, in matters of religion, *taqwā*[1] means remembrance, assiduity, retentiveness, recalling and alertness:

> Lo! those who ward off (evil), when a glamour from the devil troubleth them, they do but remember (Allāh's guidance) and behold them seers! (Qur'ān, 7:201)

إِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ اتَّقَوْا إِذَا مَسَّهُمْ طٰٓئِفٌ مِّنَ
الشَّيْطٰنِ تَذَكَّرُوْا فَإِذَا هُمْ مُّبْصِرُوْنَ (الاعراف آيت ٢٠١)

This should make it obvious that *Karīm* (honourable) and the *muttaqī* (pious) cannot be careless, whimsical, of bad memory and prolific in errors. How otherwise could one be recalling God constantly? Therefore, by virtue of *karāmat* (nobleness) the characteristics of excessive neglect, whimsicality, bad memory and excessive error are also quashed. The converse of *taqwā* is *fisq* and *fujūr* (debauchery). Therefore both in the juridical and literal sense the opposite of the *muttaqī* is the *fāsiq*. Anyone who is, therefore, *karīm* (noble) and pious will never be a *fāsiq* (debauch). The word *karīm* thus negates *fisq*. Therefore by the characteristics of *karāmat*, all the five derogators of *ḥadīth*, namely, excessive neglect, excessive errors, delusion, poor memory and excessive evil-living are completely negatived.

The third attribute is being *amīn*, or someone who holds a thing in trust, which is the root of the principles of narration. Probity is the opposite of *khiyānat* (lack of probity) which in reporting involves both falsehood and ascription of falsehood. Probity negatives both of these. Thus three detracting factors, namely, ignorance, innovation, and opposition of the reliable, are eliminated by *risālat*. The five negators—excessive negligence, excessive errors, delusion, poor memory and evil-living—are eliminated by *karāmat*, while the two remaining ones, viz., falsehood, and ascription of falsehood are removed by *amānat*. Thus in the Angel Jibrīl-i-Amīn (Gabriel, the trustee), all the vitiating elements of a narrative have been negatived because of his being *amīn*. At the same time the Angel Jibra'īl has been positively called *dhī quwwah* (powerful), as he is not one who would say anything under pressure and knowingly distort narration. He has been also called "عند ذی العرش مکین" "established in the presence of the Lord of the Throne." (Qur'ān, 81 : 20) If the word *makīn* (firmly fixed) signifies 'staying', this would mean that those in Heaven live close to God; they are extremely near Him with no sign of remoteness. They, therefore, receive and hear statements from close quarters.

The situation that arises from remoteness, namely, that they should hear and report amiss, is improbable in their case. What they, therefore, report is immaculate both with respect to narration and hearing. There is no mistake whatsoever in what is heard nor is there the least defect in words and narration, which, in the terminology of traditionists, are called *taḥammul* (bearing) and *adā* (communication); that is to say, both the hearing and communication of the report are firm and strong. Thus the source of both the principles of the *muḥaddithīn*, namely,

---

[1] Literally reverential or pious fear of God.

taḥammul and *adā*, also proves to be the Qur'ān. If the meaning of the word *makīn* is taken to be one commanding respect, it follows that the persons mentioned in the *āyah* are the denizens of the empyrean, most honoured and high-ranking in the Eyes of God; they are held in the highest esteem in the Court of Allāh. How can such favoured ones of God distort His words?

Then the Angel Jibra'īl has been called *muṭā*' (one to be obeyed) which shows his universal approbation and the highest degree of regard for his report; that is, his words are so highly prized that the universe of angels is ever eager to hear what he has to say. In sum, both before God Almighty and His creation, the love and respect in which he is held has been made clear, thereby making prominent both the position of the narrator of the Qur'ānic revelation and the distinguishing traits of narration. At the same time, the contraries of these traits are also eliminated. Thus it is established that the Qur'ānic revelation which was conveyed to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) by Jibra'īl is worthy of credence not only because it has been narrated by an angel but also because it fulfils to the most perfect degree the requirements of the principles of narration. The second reporter of the Qur'ān is the last of the Prophets (صلى الله عليه وسلم). In respect of his narration also the matter has not been confined to saying this only that he is a prophet and the crown of prophets and messengers, and that, therefore, his narration should be accepted. Indeed, this would have constituted the strongest reason and stimulus for the acceptance of his report, but merely asserting this would not have furnished such proof in accordance with the principles of narration as would have been clinching even for the negators. Therefore the testimony of the second exalted narrator, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), has been confirmed according to the principle of narration. Four qualifications were set down for him; of these, three are negative and one is positive. The negative ones are:

(i) He is not *majnūn* (insane). Obviously the narration of an insane person cannot be worthy of credence; this, in effect, implies that the narrator must be sane.

(ii) He should not be niggardly in conveying knowledge about the Unseen. On the other hand, he has public enlightenment in view. Evidently, if a person is stingy in imparting knowledge, he is prone to prevaricate in its communication so that the full text is never conveyed and the truncated report does not convey the full sense. This is the greatest foible of a narrative and is a sort of bad faith. But a person who is inspired to benefit others and is devoid of niggardliness in conveying knowledge, which is the hallmark of all accomplished persons, would always endeavour to communicate faithfully and it would be impossible that any error should make way into his report.

(iii) The Qur'ān is not the word of the accursed Satan but that revealed to and reported by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Satan is the fountainhead of all evils and wickedness, whereas the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is the well-spring of all that is good and noble, which establishes the fact that he is the compendium of excellences and accomplishments. This is enough to testify the veracity of a report.

(iv) The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) saw the angel Jibra'īl on the clear horizon. That is to say, the reporter from whom the

> Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is receiving the revelation of the Qur'ān has been seen by him with his own eyes. This is a fundamental aspect of narration. Thus, by establishing the all-comprehensive nature of the Holy Prophet's virtues, all the derogators have been eliminated just as was done in the case of the angel Jibra'īl, and by mentioning the fact of his vision, the basis of narration has been laid on actual observation, which is something basic with regard to the principles of narration.

Negation of *Ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī* is Negation of the Qur'an

The Qur'ān has, therefore, not only presented in clear terms the two basic principles of narration, sound judgment and memory, but also indicated in detail the vitiating factors and ten derogations which arise from the reverse of the two. In other words, the Qur'ān has unfolded the basic technicalities of the art of narration giving rise to the constitutional existence of correct reports, and the art of reporting appeared for the first time in the world. At the same time the high status of the *muḥaddithīn* has been made clear, for it is they who set forth the principles of narration the foundations of which were laid by the Qur'ān; in effect, by following the Qur'ān their minds were able to extract all those principles and canons which lay hid in the Qur'ān. Quite obviously, in view of its characteristics and the authoritativeness of narrators, the basic kind of the *Ḥadīth* is the *ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*, having two basic attributes, sound judgment and memory. The absence of these twin attributes results in the appearance of the ten contrary factors. Five contrary factors result from want of sound judgment—falsehood, attribution of lie, deviation, ignorance, and innovation—and from the loss of memory result excessive neglect, excessive commitment of errors, evil-living, opposition of the reliable, delusion and bad memory. All these positives and negatives have not only been clearly set forth in the Qur'ān but also put on a solid foundation. This has been done variously, at times explicitly in the Qur'ānic *nuṣūṣ* (texts) and at others implicitly by way of deduction and significance. Therefore the negation of the *ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī* is, indeed, the negation of hundreds of Qur'ānic *āyāt*. And then, on the basis of these narrations, the foundation of deciding all the affairs of the world was laid. Hence, any so-called believers in the Qur'ān who deny the *Ḥadīth* cannot, at least, deny that form of *Ḥadīth* which is known as *ḥadīth li-dhātihī*.

As for the other kinds of *Aḥādīth* which have been just described, they are the products of the *ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*. These sub-varieties come into being because of want of the twin attributes of *'adālat* and *ḍabṭ* in varying degrees and therefore all of them would be regarded as the ramifications and derivatives of the *ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī* variety in proportionate measure as their existence is associated with this basic kind. Hence in their definition first of all this fact would be mentioned and it would be said that such and such a deficiency in attributes leads to such and such a kind.

And when these sub-varieties cannot be understood without reference to the *ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*, it is all too obvious that they have no independent existence of their own, but, on the contrary are subservient to the various facts that detract from the perfection of the *ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*. These factors keep on fluctuating to different degrees giving rise to these sub-varieties. It is evident that when the source of all these varieties, the *ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī*, and the stances and comparative merits of the narrators is the Qur'ān, then the source of their subsidiaries and sub-varieties would also be the same; otherwise their already established subservience and derivation no longer exist. Thus, just as they are subservient to the *ṣaḥīḥ li-dhātihī* variety in regard to existence, they are subservient to it in proof as well. The proof for this is forthcoming from the Qur'ān, as has been discussed in detail in the foregoing, and their existence as well seems established from the Qur'ān, otherwise how can it be that the soil should nourish the seed and not the bough?

The Qur'an has Acquainted us with *Ḥadīth* and Narration

We have presented the proof for ***Ḥadīth*** as a class from the *āyah* in which it has been stated "ان علينا بيانه" (Lo, upon Us (resteth) the explanation thereof) earlier. We have also delineated the four kinds of *Aḥādīth* from the standpoint of the number of narrators and discussed one of them, the continuous, from the successive narration of the Qur'ān as a whole and from the report of the Qur'ān being the Qur'ān; and in the course thereof the *Ḥadīth* as a class and narration *per se* were proved once again. Then of these four, the remaining three kinds *khabar-i-mashhūr*, *khabar-i-'azīz* and *khabar-i-gharīb* were proved from the different *āyāt* to show how the number of narrators defines the nature of a narrative. This further shows that the foundations of all these basic kinds which arise from the number of narrators, more or less, and their multiplicity or otherwise, and which the *muḥaddithīn* have maintained in the books on the terminology of the *Ḥadīth*, have been laid by the Qur'ān itself. Similarly, that character and conduct which make their report acceptable, and those two basic virtues to which all the merits of the narrators gravitate, have also been determined by the Qur'ān, namely, sound judgment and memory, for which two clear *āyāt* have been put forward. The ten vitiating factors which grow out of the want or absence of these factors have their origin in the Qur'ān. Thus it is the Qur'ān that has laid the foundation of the Science of the Tradition and its derivatives. This should make it obvious that not only the *Ḥadīth* as class but its basic kinds and characteristics have also been defined by the Qur'ān. What for? The answer is unequivocal. The Qur'ān did this because it needed exposition, and so acquainted the world with both the system of narration and the *Ḥadīth* of which it was hitherto unaware. Previously men did not know what narration is and what is its authority, and what is the criterion for accuracy and inaccuracy. The Qur'ān made a distinction for the first time of the characteristics of the *Aḥādīth* with regard to the number of narrators and their merits. It also fixed the measure of how many kinds of reports should be possible in such a case and what ranks these reports should have in view of their reliability and evidence and so on. All this is so because the object was that, in this way, the Traditions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) should come before the commonalty of mankind, blazing the trail of the living and perfect implementation of Qur'ānic commands, so that people should know what is the way of the most perfect of Prophets (صلى الله عليه وسلم). *Isnād* (authority) and *riwāyat* (narration) are, therefore, a distinguishing feature of Islam, which no other religion has, as it is the Qur'ān which has given us the basic principles governing the mode of determining the authenticity of a report, its investigation and exposition. The Qur'ān stands on these principles and so does its exposition, the *Ḥadīth*.

Discrediting Islam by Discrediting the Qur'an

This distinctive feature of Islam proved intolerable to its enemies, particularly the Jews and the Christians and their intellectual offspring that accepted their imprint and was nurtured on their pernicious influence. So, "through envy for the sake of it," "حسداً من عند انفسهم" as the Qur'ān says, they tried to obliterate this feature. Their line of attack was to raise doubts about the mode of narrative of both the *Ḥadīth* and the Qur'ān and so make the simpleminded followers of Islam turn away from it in disgust. But He who is the real Guardian of Faith and is its Revealer, guarded it, rendered their efforts abortive. As a last resort, out of their malignity, and in the name of the Qur'ān itself, they conspired to sabotage the process of Qur'ānic revelation and its exposition, namely, the Prophetic narration. But the Qur'ān frustrated their efforts, making their machination boomerang upon them. In connection with the *Ḥadīth* and narration the Qur'ān has declared itself to be the source of the authoritative *Ḥadīth*, derogatory *Ḥadīth*, the *Ḥadīth* relating to the merits of the narrators, the number of narrators and the kinds of *Aḥādīth* in respect of their merits arising from their greater and lesser number, and various kinds of narration etc. arising from their weakness and strength, so that no malevolent person should dare to make a stalking-horse of the Qur'ān itself to discredit its own exposition.

Therefore, the narrations of *Aḥadīth*, whether they depend upon the number of narrators or on their contents, can never go beyond the Qur'ān because it is their mainspring and they are not a product of human invention or fabrication. The names, titles and technical terms, however, have been determined by the scholars suited to their nature. This determination surely can not mean that the facts are also the product of their ingenuity. Obviously when these standard principles of classification and sub-classification of the *Ḥadīth* into different categories and sub-categories have been established by the Qur'ān, the negation of *Ḥadīth* is in reality the negation of the Qur'ān and the denial of the authoritative stance of the *Ḥadīth* constitutes denial of the authoritative stance of the Qur'ān.

The Guardianship of the Qur'an and the *Ḥadīth* by God unto the Heart of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

In any case it is not only that the foundation of the *Ḥadith* has been laid by the Qur'ān and that it is merely the source thereof, but it has further claimed that the *Ḥadīth* is preserved through divine agency. After this, not only can the *Ḥadīth* not be denied, but its denial is like dashing one's head against a rock; the denial cannot damage the *Ḥadīth* but the denier's faith would certainly be harmed. For according to the Qur'ān, its understanding is not possible without exposition, and divine Intents and Purposes cannot be unfolded without it. Thus the guarding of the Qur'ān cannot mean merely the preservation of its words only, but the Qur'ān and its exposition both because one aspect of the Qur'ān is its Words which are related to divine recitation and the motion of the Prophet's tongue, and the other is its spirit, meanings and purposes which are related to exposition and elucidation by Allāh or His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Thus the preservation and perpetuation of the Qur'ān means that not only its words and expression but meanings and objectives should also be safeguarded. The preservation of the Words without the meanings would mean guarding only half the Holy Book and not the whole. In the reverse event also, if the meanings are preserved but the verbal part is left out, only half the Qur'ān would be preserved and half left unguarded. Complete preservation can only be ensured when the words and meanings, i.e., the Qur'ān and its exegesis, are both kept intact. If not, the preservation will be incomplete, and not worth the name, although the promise that has been made is for total guarding. This is evident from the word "حافظون" (*ḥāfiẓūn*) used in the absolute sense. So God has taken upon Himself the responsibility for preserving the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* both, as it would have been difficult for the one to survive without the other.

Insofar as the personality of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is concerned, God undertook the responsibility for the preservation of both as is apparent from the word *'alaynā* which signifies taking of something upon oneself; through this word the preservation of the Word of God in the heart of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was undertaken, as discussed in the introductory part of this prolegomena. The meaning of the word 'Qur'ān' is *mā yuqraw* (something to be read), which can only consist of words, not meanings. Hence the words (Lo! upon Us (resteth) the putting together thereof and the reading thereof[1]) signify the promise of guarding the words of the Qur'ān. Again, by repeating the same word *'alaynā* was conveyed a promise to unfold the meanings of the Qur'ānic words to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) by means of *bayān* (exposition). *Bayān* implies exposition and clarification, and it is only the meanings that are explained, not the words, which are known to a novice even. Therefore in "ثم ان علينا بيانه" "Then lo, upon Us (resteth) the explanation thereof" the assurance about guarding the exposition is again emphasized, especially by the word *thumma*, meaning "then" which precedes *'alaynā* denoting the taking over of the charge of guarding by God. It has no connection with the first category of responsibility which would make the word *'alaynā* superfluous. Thus the repetition of the word *'alaynā*, with the word *thumma* separating both the statements, makes fully explicit the nature of this responsibility that the words of the Qur'ān and its exposition would both be guarded. It should be clear that, whatever might have been the manner in which *bayān* (exposition) in respect of the Qur'ān was transmitted to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), when the exposition took the form of words, it would constitute the *Ḥadīth*, the theme of which is from God but the words are those of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Through *thumma 'alaynā* the responsibility for guarding the *bayān* in the mind of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has been taken up by God. This means that the responsibility for guarding *Ḥadīth* through the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) also stands proven, God being the Overseer Who has the charge of the Qur'ān and its exposition both. So if the words of the Qur'ān "مايقرأ" (something to be read) cannot be lost, then "مايبين" (what is interpreted) cannot also be lost. God conveyed the first thing, that is the words of the Qur'ān, to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) through recitation so that at places God calls Himself *Qārī* (Reciter) by saying "فاذا قرأناه" (When we start reciting)[1] and at others the Narrator by saying "نتلوا عليک" (We narrate unto you)[2]. On the other hand the intents and purposes of the Qur'ān were conveyed to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) through instruction because the object of knowledge is not to identify words but to make their significance understood, which is known as 'education'. That is why God has called Himself the Educator of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم):

---

[1] Qur'ān, 75:17. [2] Qur'ān, 75:19.

And teacheth thee that which thou knewest not. The grace of Allāh towards thee hath been infinite. (Qur'ān, 4:113)

وَعَلَّمَكَ مَا لَمْ تَكُنْ تَعْلَمُ وَكَانَ فَضْلُ
اللّٰهِ عَلَيْكَ عَظِيْمًا (النساء، آیت ۱۱۳)

Sometimes this education has been called Guidance (*hidāyat*) which is associated with implications and not with words. That is why God has mentioned the gratitude which the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) owes to Him in respect of the Book of God and faith in Allāh. God has said: "We, only We, guided you to the objective of faith; otherwise you were unaware of these before." Further

Thou knewest not what the Scripture was, nor what the Faith. But We have made it a light whereby We guide whom We will of our bondmen. (Qur'ān, 42:52)

مَا كُنْتَ تَدْرِيْ مَا الْكِتٰبُ وَلَا الْاِيْمَانُ
وَلٰكِنْ جَعَلْنٰهُ نُوْرًا نَّهْدِيْ بِهٖ مَنْ نَّشَآءُ مِنْ
عِبَادِنَا (شوری، آیت ۵۲)

In the event, the words of God and their significance were conveyed to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) intact through divine guidance and education and were consolidated and preserved in the heart of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Divine Protection of the Qur'an and its Exposition for the *Ummah*

We all know that the object of the Qur'ān is to ensure gradual rise to perfection of all men till the Doomsday, as is evident from the verse "انی رسول الله الیکم جمیعاً" "Lo! I am the Messenger of Allāh to you all." (Qur'ān, 7:158) This lofty purpose could not have been accomplished merely by the inspirational education imparted to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the recitation of the Qur'ān to him until and unless the divine word and its exposition are conveyed to the whole *ummah* exactly under the same divine protection and are guarded till the end of the world in the same way as it was guarded in the heart of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) on having reached there. For this reason, God imposed upon the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) the same charge of guiding and educating the *ummah* which He had taken upon Himself in respect of educating and guiding him. That is, he should read the *āyāt* of the Qur'ān to the *ummah* in order that its words should reach it as well as establish concatenation of educating people and providing them guidance so that the intents and purposes of God Almighty should also reach the *ummah* and a system for the continuous onward transmission of the Qur'ān and its exposition as a sacred trust should come into operation.

Accordingly, the responsibilities of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) were indicated in the following verse:

Allāh verily hath shown grace to the believers by sending unto them a messenger of their own who reciteth unto them His revelations, and causeth them to grow, and teacheth them the Scripture and wisdom; although before (he came to them) they were in flagrant error. (Qur'ān, 3:164)

لَقَدْ مَنَّ اللّٰهُ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ اِذْ بَعَثَ فِيْهِمْ
رَسُوْلًا مِّنْ اَنْفُسِهِمْ يَتْلُوْا عَلَيْهِمْ اٰيٰتِهٖ وَيُزَكِّيْهِمْ
وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ الْكِتٰبَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَاِنْ كَانُوْا مِنْ قَبْلُ
لَفِيْ ضَلٰلٍ مُّبِيْنٍ (آلِ عمران، آیت ۱۶۴)

In this *āyah* the same responsibility of reciting the Qur'ān and imparting education has been placed upon the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) which God had taken upon Himself with respect to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) so much so that the entrusting of this duty as a part of his mission was duly intimated. But as to whether the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did give a practical shape to this surrogateship or not, conveying the exposition of the Qur'ān to the *ummah* along with the Qur'ān, it was expressly said about education: "يعلمكم مالم تكونوا تعلمون" "He teacheth you that which ye know not" (Qur'ān, 2:151) and about guidance: "وانک لتهدی الی صراط مستقیم" "And lo! thou verily dost guide unto a right path." (Qur'ān, 42:52)

As regards exposition it was said:

And we have revealed unto thee the Remembrance that thou mayst explain to mankind that which hath been revealed for them. (Qur'ān, 16:44)	وَاَنْزَلْنَاۤ اِلَيْكَ الذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ اِلَيْهِمْ (النحل، آیت ۴۴)

Thus it is proved that the recitation which came to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) through divine education, exposition and guidance proceeded exactly from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to the *ummah*. It is also clearly shown that ever since the descent of the Qur'ān began its exposition has been a necessary accompaniment thereof because without this the Qur'ān would be but a set of words the meanings and contents of which would be determined by people themselves according to their own understanding so that inferences and interpretation would be merely conjectural. It is because of this that the responsibility for recitation and reading of the Qur'ān as well as the charge for imparting guidance, education, and exposition was undertaken by the Divine Author Himself. This clearly shows the Qur'ānic words also to be those of God and their communication is known as *bayān* or exposition. Hence God has called Himself the First Reader of the Qur'ān, as is evident from "فاذا قرأناه" "and when We begin to read it" otherwise the words "فاذا قرأته" "and when you read it" would have been employed. Similarly, God has called Himself the First Expositor and Interpreter of the Qur'ān also as is evident from "ثم ان علينا بيانه" "Then lo! Upon Us (resteth) the explanation thereof", or else "ثم ان علیک بیانه" "Its exposition will rest on you" would have been said. Thus by calling Himself the First Reader and the First Expositor, God has claimed that, whether they be the words of the Qur'ān or its meanings, both have been revealed by Him. In neither does the Prophet's composition or improvisation have any place whatsoever. Both are inseparably bound up with each other. Neither will the words be of any use without the meaning, nor can the meanings be adduced without express words. It is natural, therefore, to conclude that, wherever the descent of the Qur'ān figures, it will necessarily signify the descent of exposition as well, as without the descent of words the descent of meanings would be futile. Similarly whenever and wherever we speak about the preservation of the Qur'ān the preservation of the exposition would be included as well, since without preservation of the latter preservation of the words would be meaningless. So when God said: "انا نحن نزلنا الذكر" "Lo! even We, reveal the Reminder", (Qur'ān, 15:9)it cannot mean that God Almighty sent His Word into the world without meanings and purport, or the meanings were sent without words. The only plausible meaning of this *āyah* is that the Qur'ān was sent into the world in its plenary form, that is plenary with regard both to words and their significance. Both the words and their implications are from God, since God read them (through the Angel Jibra'īl) before the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and reading is of words only. Similarly God explained the significance of the words of the Qur'ān by exposition, and when we speak of explaining something, it is implied that the meanings and significances are to be expatiated upon. The word *dhikr* here means both the Qur'ān and its exposition both of which are revealed. In the next part of this *āyah* it has been stated in respect of guarding the Qur'ān: "وانا له لحافضون" "And lo! We verily are its Guardian." Here the pronoun in *laḥū* refers to that very *dhikr* which signifies the Qur'ān as well as its exposition. If this is so, then *bayān* or the exposition of the Qur'ān shall be within the corral of preservation together with the Qur'ān itself and God's guardianship with respect to both shall have to be acknowledged. What is thus meant is that, until and unless the exposition of the Qur'ān is protected, the protection accorded to the Qur'ān alone will go only half the way and remain both incomplete and defective. In the *āyah* under consideration the word *laḥāfiẓūn* has been employed as a nominative absolute, which, according to the Arabic grammar, should oblige us to accept it as the absolute guardian, and plenary guardianship comprehends both words and meanings, the Qur'ān and its exposition, as has been just explained.

The meaning of the *āyah*, therefore, runs something like this: God Almighty is the Guardian of the Qur'ānic words and their meanings and exposition. Obviously God cannot be the Guardian of the words only and not of their implications and significance, although it is the meaning of the word that conveys the connotation of the word itself and its objectives. What boots it to have the means when the end is lost? On the same analogy the *āyah* cannot mean that God Almighty should be the Guardian of the meanings and not of the words, since, if the symbols are lost, it will not be possible to find our way to the meanings. In this case, the very meanings cannot exist, let alone preservation thereof. This would have been possible only in case the word *laḥāfiẓūn* had been identified with specific word or significance; then the preservation of that alone would have been meant. But the fact that this expression has been used in the absolute sense, indicates that both implication and exposition are covered by it. In the event, if from amongst the words, implications, reading, and exposition even one species is missing, the guardianship of the Qur'ān would not be possible, although this is the very thing the safeguarding of which is being declared. In fact, the Qur'ān itself would no longer remain, to say nothing of its formal preservation.

The Guardianship of the Quran and its Exposition for All Time

Again, just as the word *laḥāfiẓūn* comprehends all categories and does not mean exclusively words or meanings, but comprehends both, similarly, it is absolute in time also, with no tag attached to it of a particular period, confining this guarding of words and meanings only in the past, present or future, but extends to all times. This means that God has undertaken to accord protection both to His Words and their Exposition in all ages. Therefore no one can be permitted to consider it purely temporary in its content and connotation, and by protection or guardianship is meant the period of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and his Companions only, otherwise it would lead to delimitation of the absolute which amounts to altering and distorting the texts of the Qur'ān. Hence this very *āyah* conclusively proves the eternity of the Divine Guardianship with regard to the Qur'ān and its *bayān*.

Be that as it may, the Divine Protection afforded to the words and meanings of the Qur'ān through recitation and exposition, according to "علينا جمعه" "Lo! Upon us (resteth) the putting together thereof" and "علينا بيانه" "Upon us (resteth) the explanation thereof" to the extent of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), extends *mutatis mutandus* to the Divine Protection of the Qur'ān and its exposition to the *ummah* as well for all times, whether it be by way of transmission and reporting or correspondence. So far as the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is concerned, the Qur'ān and its exposition were preserved as a subjective communication and for the *ummah* at large in the form of objective transmission and reporting, or committing to writing. Thus, the guarding of this exposition of the Qur'ān, known as *Ḥadīth*, first from Allāh Himself to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and then from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to the *ummah*, for all times to come, stands proven from the Qur'ān.

Furthermore, if Islam is the last and the only permanent and true religion, and the Qur'ān is the last Eternal Book, then this *āyah* guaranteeing protection and its claim thereof should also be operative till the end of time, for if a part of the whole is not eternal how can the whole be so? Consequently, when the word of God (Qur'ān) has been adjudged eternal by its Creator, it is but a dictate of logic that we should acknowledge the act of preserving the book as permanent also, otherwise God Almighty's claim for the preservation of the Qur'ān and exposition would prove unfounded. Therefore it is necessary that the protection of the Qur'ān and the exposition should continue till the Doomsday the endurance of which till eternity by God Almighty stands proven by the above *āyah*. In short, just as God put together and preserved the words and significance of his revelation (the Qur'ān) in the heart of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) with full protection, similarly, the Prophet, in turn, infused the Qur'ān and its exposition in the mind of the *ummah* with divine aid. Thus both the Qur'ān and its Exposition were transmitted in their entirety through the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to the *ummah*. The only difference is that the Word of God and its Exposition reached the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) directly by mutual harmony without the intervention of a causal chain but the way was prepared for their perpetual communication from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to the *ummah* in an explicit manner. Therefore just as the preservation of the words of the Qur'ān was brought about by its being committed to memory by people so that the narration of the Qur'ān continued and will continue *ad infinitum* through successive generations and it has remained and will continue to remain as a sacred trust in the hearts of thousands and thousands of men, similarly the preservation of the *Aḥādīth*, that is the Exposition thereof, was contrived through those who committed them to memory because they had been endowed with extraordinary memories by the Divine Guarantor and Guardian. Through the possession of a marvellous power of memorization, the *salaf* (first three Muslim generations) transmitted the texts of the *Aḥādīth* as well as the authorities on which they are based to the *khalaf* in a scientific manner, which is nothing short of a miracle. Such *Aḥādīth* cannot be held fit for rejection or unacceptable either from the point of view of general vogue or legality. Thus the *Aḥādīth* became a sacred trust in the hearts of hundreds of thousands of men.

Thereafter, exegesists established hundreds of full-fledged sciences for the protection of the Qur'ānic knowledge so much so that merely to record their names whole books were written such as *Al-itqān fī 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān* of 'Allāmah Jalāl al-Dīn Suyūtī, *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* of Imām Ghazālī and so on. These works opened the door to various types of Islamic sciences so that the Qur'ān was preserved in each and every respect as regards form and substance and the custodians thereof became known as the 'Ulamā (savants). One class of scholars preserved its words and became known as *ḥuffāẓ* (pl. of *hāfiẓ*, a memorizer). Another took care of the *i'rāb* (orthography) so that the wordings of the Qur'ānic text should be properly preserved. The number of the *kalimāt* (single words), *rukū'* (paragraphs) and *sūrahs* were counted and computerized. A group watched over the way in which the Qur'ān should be recited. Members of this group are called *qurrā*'[1] and *mujawwidīn*[2]. Still another group specialized in transcribing the Qur'ān and became known as *khaṭṭāṭ* (calligraphists). Those who specialized in the words and idioms of the Qur'ān became *'ulamā-i-mufradāt* (philologists). Different scholars took up the task of preserving the connotations of the Qur'ān in the light of Exposition designated *Sunnah* (whether by way of statement or act) which ramified into different disciplines. Some of these are outlined below :—

(i) Exegesis in term of words and idioms of the Qur'ān, spotlighting its eloquence and rhetorical effects.
(ii) Exegesis in the light of reports and narratives, the scholars of which are known as *ahl al-athār*.
(iii) Preservation of particulars derived from general principles by scholars who are called *fuqahā* (jurists).
(iv) Manifestation of ratiocinative and philosophical aspects by *ḥukamā al-Islam* and *ahl al-kalām* (philosophers and scholastics).
(v) Derivation of vital elements from the general and particular principles which took the form of Law. Those who sponsored this activity were called *Imāms* and *mujtahids*.
(vi) Supervision of the parables, precepts, and saws, etc. of the Qur'ān. These scholars are called the *Khuṭabā* (orators).
(vii) Preservation of tales, episodes and events occurring in the Qur'ān the scholars of which are known as historians.
(viii) Deduction of principles, general and particular, from partial data resulting in specific sciences. Such scholars are *mufakkirīn* (thinkers).[3]
(ix) Deduction of problems for which differential categories and terms appropriate to them were determined such as repealing and repealed, established and allegorical, general and particular, absolute and conditional, expression and connotation, demand (*iqtiḍā*) and indication (*ishārah*), succinct and elucidatory. These scholars are known as the *'ulamā al-uṣūl*.
(x) Determination of the causal factors which govern the principles of historiography in the context of the ethos, mentality and cultural spirit of nations, and the reasons behind their rise, decline and fall. Such savants are the *'ulamā-i-idārah* (sociologists).
(xi) Extraction of the *bāṭinī* (inner, esoteric) disciplines and knowledge of psychological and parapsychological experiences and their preservation. These scholars are called the *'urafā* (seers).

---

[1] Plural of *qārī*, that is, one who intones the Qur'ān. [2] Also the intoners of the Qur'ān. [3] In the sūrah *Al-Nūr* it has been said: "والله خلق كل دابة من ماء" "Allāh hath created every animal of water" (Qur'ān, 24:45). Thus here it has been shown that life was generated in water from hydrogen and oxygen. This takes us back to the causal event when hydrogen was created, a causal event which even the most sceptic of scientists cannot deny. This *āyah* alone embodies the whole theory of evolution. How this is to be explained is the function of exegesists. *Ed.*

In short, there is not a single aspect of the lexicographical, semantic, and implicational aspect of the Qur'ān that has not been covered. The glory of the whole process is that not one mode of preservation is concocted but derived, based as it is on the Qur'ān and its Exposition, and there exists chapter and verse for all the sciences in them. Each and every discipline mentioned above is but interpretation of some verse of the Qur'ān or narration, so that just testimony has been adduced for the issue or problem discussed from an *āyah* or *ḥadīth*.[1] Thus it is obvious that it is the *Ḥadīth* or *Sunnah* which has guided the learned towards these disciplines and not the mind or intellect of the scholars themselves. Even if their own intellect has been used sometimes, it has been considered worthy of attention only if it derives light from the *Sunnah* that is the *Ḥadīth*, to the lasting amazement of the whole world: "ولو كره الكافرون" "However much the disbelievers are averse." (Qur'ān, 61:18) Then, just as the preservation of the Qur'ān is effected through the *ummah* by divine dispensation, the preservation of its exposition or the *Ḥadīth* is also providentially contrived in a like manner. While the *ummah* showed remarkable assiduity and energy in preserving the Book, it strove even more vigorously to preserve the *Sunnah* and accomplished feats in this behalf which the followers of no other religion have been able to do even for their scriptures.

The only difference was that since the Qur'ān was revealed in verbal form it was incumbent to preserve its words as well because the Revelation was verbal and its very miracle consisted in being so, but in the revelation not recited by God, that is the *Ḥadīth* and *Sunnah*, the substance was from God but the words were not so. For this reason it was not essential that its words too should be literally preserved; it was permissible to report even the implication. Therefore, the *ummah* expended all its energies on the preservation of the thematic content of the *Ḥadīth* though it made strenuous efforts to preserve the words also. Thus the words of each *ḥadīth* are either preserved as they were or are so near it as if they were almost the same. Anyway the preservation of the Traditions was contrived by God Himself.

The first period of the collection of the Traditions is represented by the Age of the Companions. At that time most of the *Aḥādīth* remained ensconced within the minds of the Companions and others. Although the copying down of the Traditions had then commenced, as has been explicitly mentioned in many reports, still, by and large, it was memorization of the Traditions that featured far more prominently and the Companions fulfilled the divine promise most punctiliously and conscientiously with the help of their memory because they believed the obligation to preserve the Qur'ān lay with them as if this promise was being held out to them alone.

---

[1] This point needs some elaboration. The only *Sharī'ah* which comes a very poor second compared to the Muslim is the Jewish. The crowning achievement of the *ijmā'* among the Jews was the Congress of the Rabbīs in the spring of 329 A.D. at Tverya or Tiberias in Palestine. But what the Congress did was to codify the edicts of the past *rabbīs*. These codes were rarely based on the codes laid down by the so-called Israelite prophets. None of the *isnād* could be traced back to any of the prophets. There is such a great hiatus between the rules laid down and what the prophets might have meant that the Judaic *Sharī'ah*, at its face value, is virtually impossible to follow to the letter. The case of a widow who cannot remarry if her husband's brother is alive is a case in point. Here is a sample of the Jewish *Sharī'ah* : "And a false tooth is not added to the mouth permanently, but must be put in each day, and is therefore exactly like the false curl of a woman, which may not be worn." Similarly, the ridiculous extent to which *Sabbat* or *Shabbat* (God's resting day) has been stretched bespeaks the permanently anthropomorphic trait among the Jews of today. The aim of the Judaic *Sharī'ah* seems to be to work out the details of religion as far as possible and not to simplify it. *Ed.*

The second period is that of collection. This is the period succeeding that of the Companions and is characterized by the transcription of the Traditions over all parts of the Muslim world. The memorizers of the Traditions had the *Aḥādīth* copied, and took the fullest care to substantiate their veracity by quoting the authorities.

The third period is the one known as *ta'zīr al-ḥadīth* (sifting of Traditions) in which by a process of differentiation, *Aḥādīth* proper were separated from the statements of the Companions and *Tābi'īn* and consolidated. This was succeeded by the period of criticism when the fabricators (*waḍḍā'īn*) who were, in fact, denignators of the Traditions in the guise of acceptors, arose and the period of sound scholars who winnowed the authentic traditions, commenced. Each *Ḥadīth* was examined as to its authoritativeness, the *ṣaḥīḥ Aḥādīth* (correct traditions) were separated from the *ḍa'īf* (weak) and the genuine from the fabricated ones. The *isnād* (authority) also began to be emphasised, so that it might be possible to precisely determine how reliable is the authority behind a *ḥadīth*.

The *Aḥādīth* were classified on the basis of authority, their credentials and the number of narrators, exactly according to the principles laid down by the Qur'ān, as has been already discussed in some detail. This led to the different terminological titles of different kinds of *Aḥādīth*, and the *ummah*, displaying its remarkable acumen and genius in this behalf, preserved them in a scientific manner.

Scientific Preservation of the *Ḥadīth*

Passing from the period of inception the *Ḥadīth* reached its preservative stage during the first century A.H.; it was collected in the second and separated from the statements of the Companions in the third. Thereafter, it was subjected to close scrutiny as to authenticity and collated in the fourth. Finally, it was classified into different categories and reduced to order in the subsequent ages till, at last, it was preserved in a scientific manner. The enormous work done by the *ummah* in this behalf might be appreciated by the fact that about eighty-two disciplines were evolved for its preservation and the art of reporting or narration was examined from every aspect, such that each aspect of it has assumed the status of a discipline in itself and thousands of books were written on each of them because of which the sciences of *Ḥadīth* like *matn al-Ḥadīth* (text of the *Ḥadīth*), *sanad al-Ḥadīth* (authority behind the *Ḥadīth* as evinced by the transmissional chains), *aqsām al-Ḥadīth* (different kinds or classes of the *Ḥadīth*), *gharīb al-Ḥadīth* (*Aḥādīth* based on individual report or narration), *muṣṭaliḥāt al-Ḥadīth* (technical terms employed in the science of the Traditions), *'ilal al-Ḥadīth* (scruples about the narrators of *Ḥadīth*), *maṭā'in al-Ḥadīth* (the factors that vitiate the authenticity of a *ḥadīth*), and *asmā' al-rijāl* (the names of the authorities constituting transmissional chain). All these assumed the form of regular full-fledged sciences and many more extremely important disciplines relating to reporting sprang up through the stimulating influence exercised by the Traditions which ensured that the survival of the *Ḥadīth* no longer depended upon mere memory of people or the personal affinity and endeavour of a person but it should become a regular discipline fully supported by scientific principles and dictates of logic so that the marvellous achievement in this domain has become one of the greatest exploits of history and a matter of glory for the Muslims.

Then, just as God's protection showed the sublime miracle of raising memorizers of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* as well as scholars of both these who stood for the guardianship of their words and significances, and recitation and exposition, similarly, the Almighty, by His true promise that a party of righteous persons succoured by God would always be there whom their opponents would not be able to harm or disgrace, do whatever they may, assured that, after the *salaf* every age shall have *khalaf al-ṣāliḥ* (righteous successors) who will expose the distortions of the extremists, the lies of the false and the rank follies of the ignorant. It was further promised that if, in spite of all this, deceitful and crafty people continued to perpetrate deception upon laymen and tried to create confusion among them by their loquacity and chicanery in respect of the Qur'ān and its exposition then each century shall bring forth a *mujaddid* who shall revive the pristine religion.

The Negators of *Ḥadīth*: A Forewarning

Even a more signal measure for the divine safeguarding of the Qur'ān and the Traditions is the fact that God Himself has forewarned us clearly regarding various types of such saboteurs, the devious ways in which they shall operate, laying a network of deceits and lies to waylay the believers, and their pernicious intentions so that lovers of truth in the *ummah* should remain wide-awake to the designs of these people and the clever stratagems of such people should not lead the *ummah* astray by their one-sided activities.

Fabricators

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has already sounded a warning in his Traditions about the different kinds of the deniers of the *Ḥadīth* and the devious ways and modes they would adopt to discredit the Traditions. About one class he said that this will spring up in the form of fabricators who will coin *Aḥādīth*. The aim of such counterfeit or ersatz *Aḥādīth* would be that the whole science of the Traditions would lose its credence and lead to denial thereof. *Ḥadrat* Abū Hurayrah has quoted the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ عیلہ وسلم) as having said:

In later times such charlatans and liars will arise as will relate such concocted *Aḥādīth* to you which neither you nor your forbears could have ever heard. Beware of them lest they should lead you astray and generate internecine strife amongst you. (*Muslim*)

يَكُوْنُ فِيْ اٰخِرِ الزَّمَانِ دَجَّالُوْنَ كَذَّابُوْنَ يَاْتُوْنَكُمْ مِّنَ الْاَحَادِيْثِ مَالَمْ تَسْمَعُوْا اَنْتُمْ وَلَآ اٰبَآؤُكُمْ فَاِيَّاكُمْ وَاِيَّاهُمْ لَا يُضِلُّوْنَكُمْ وَلَا يَفْتِنُوْنَكُمْ (رواہ مسلم)

This is a prognostication about the persons who, apparently calling the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* absolutely trustworthy, would subtly generate incredibility by coining *Aḥādīth* and getting them intermixed with the genuine ones so that people at large may gradually lose their faith in the institution of the *Ḥadīth*.

The Negators of the *Ḥadīth*

The second class of persons about whom the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has spoken is that of the negators who will openly deny the Traditions in order to discredit or destroy them and very cunningly taking cover of the Qur'ān, contrive to put an end to its exposition, that is the *Ḥadīth*, by the Qur'ān itself. According to a narration by Miqdād bin Ma'dīkarb, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said:

اَلَا اِنِّیْ اُوْتِیْتُ الْقُرْاٰنَ وَمِثْلَهٗ مَعَهٗ اَلَا
یُوْشِكُ رَجُلٌ شَبْعَانُ عَلٰی اَرِیْکَتِهٖ یَقُوْلُ عَلَیْکُمْ
بِهٰذَا الْقُرْاٰنِ فَمَا وَجَدْتُّمْ فِیْهِ مِنْ حَلَالٍ فَاَحِلُّوْهُ
وَمَا وَجَدْتُّمْ فِیْهِ مِنْ حَرَامٍ فَحَرِّمُوْهُ وَاِنَّ مَا
حَرَّمَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ کَمَا حَرَّمَ اللّٰهُ اَلَا یَحِلُّ لَکُمُ الْحِمَارُ
الْاَهْلِیُّ وَلَا کُلُّ ذِیْ نَابٍ مِّنَ السِّبَاعِ وَلَا لُقْطَةُ
مُعَاهِدٍ اِلَّا اَنْ یَّسْتَغْنِیَ عَنْهَا صَاحِبُهَا (رواہ ابوداؤد)

Know that the Qur'ān has been revealed to me and its analogue (the *Hadith*) also. Be alert! there will come a time when you will come across a well-fed and healthy person sitting on his couch and reclining on a pillow saying: "O people! hold fast unto the Qur'ān. Whatever is prohibited in it you should accept as prohibited and whatever has been allowed therein, consider permissible; the *Aḥādīth* are not at all trustworthy, although it is a fact that the Prophet of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) also has prohibited many things in the Traditions, just as God has done in the Qur'ān. See that the flesh of the domestic ass is prohibited; so is that of animals with incisors (carnivorous). It is not lawful to pick up even a stray trifle of a non-believing ally from the roadside unless its owner relinquishes his claim upon it, after you have informed him, etc., etc. (*Abū Dā'ūd*)

This *ḥadīth* has also disclosed the *raison d'etre* behind negation of the *Ḥadīth* also. This would be the result of being well-fed and opulent because freedom from want and poverty would lead to scepticism about religion. The Qur'ān has said:

كَلَّآ اِنَّ الْاِنْسَانَ لَيَطْغٰىٓ ۙ اَنْ رَّاٰهُ اسْتَغْنٰى
(العلق، آیت ٦، ٧)

Nay, but verily man is rebellious.
that he thinketh himself independent,
(Qur'ān, 96:6-7)

A little of thought will show that the fabricators of *Aḥadīth* follow the footsteps of the *Rāfidīs* (Deserters) who fabricated thousands of *Aḥādīth* to show that the Qur'ān has been interpolated while the negators of the *Aḥādīth* are like the Kharijites who, claiming to profess the Qur'ān, denied the *Ḥadīth*.

The Distorters are Unreliable

The two classes we have discussed so far are those which have raised dissention within the *ummah* by openly negating the authority of the *Ḥadīth* or by distorting its text. But we have been apprised of another kind also which, while acknowledging the text of the *Ḥadīth*, distorted its meaning. We have been told about these subtle distorters of the *Ḥadīth* also. Ostensibly admitting both the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*, such people, nonetheless, regard themselves free to interpret them considering their reason to be the sole arbiter in determining signification and thus, exercising their own reason and personal endeavour to tamper with the meaning of the Qur'ān and the traditions in such a way as to develop a schismatic spirit in the *ummah*.

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) therefo ore said

تَفَرَّقَتِ الْیَهُوْدُ عَلٰی اَحَدٍ وَّسَبْعِیْنَ فِرْقَةً وَّ
تَفَرَّقَتِ النَّصَارٰی عَلٰی ثِنْتَیْنِ وَسَبْعِیْنَ فِرْقَةً وَّ
سَتَفْتَرِقُ اُمَّتِیْ عَلٰی ثَلٰثٍ وَّسَبْعِیْنَ فِرْقَةً کُلُّهَا
فِی النَّارِ اِلَّا وَاحِدَةً۔

The Jews underwent divisions into seventy-one sects and the Christians into seventy-two. And so shall my *ummah* fission off into seventy-three sects; all of them but one shall be marked for Hell.

This splitting up into different sects has occurred not because f the denial of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* but under the cover of affirmation, giving rise to seventy-two sects on doctrinal basis. This is exactly the specious type of interpretation characteristic of the Jews and the Christians which led to seventy-two false sects among them and because of which the real tenets of the Pentateuch and the New Testament gradually got lost.

يُحَرِّفُوْنَ الْكَلِمَ عَنْ مَّوَاضِعِهٖ وَنَسُوْا حَظًّا
مِّمَّا ذُكِّرُوْا بِهٖ (المائدہ، آیت ۱۳)

They change words from the context
and forget a part of that. (Qur'ān, 5:13)

Just as God has told mankind how He would protect the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* by saying He would keep sending different kinds of people who would salvage the religion in times of critical juncture such as the *mujaddids*, just rulers and those divinely succoured, similarly He has informed of various kinds of men who disingenuously tamper with, misappropriate or ruthlessly assail God's guardianship, some being imposters, others liars, and yet others hankerers after loaves and fishes and satiates; some will deny the wording of Qur'ānic exposition (*Ḥadīth*) and some its meanings and implications. Others will question its validity, throw ironic remarks and innuendos on its historicity and yet others will hold the Qur'ān itself to be a spurious and fabricated document and try to draw people away from Islam. Thus, some will deny the Qur'ān and some its exposition. And actually these imposters and miscreants waylay the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* in every possible way as regards words and meanings, canons and principles. As I have already said, the exposition is an essential adjunct of the Qur'ān without which the Book of God cannot be sustained at all. These evil-minded persons denied the exposition of the Qur'ān in a number of ways in order to sabotage it in furtherance of their nefarious designs. But thanks to the indefatigable endeavours of the scholars and the *muḥaddithīn* who discharged the duty of preserving the Qur'ān by preserving the *Aḥādīth* ,by devising scientific methods and techniques, and by making use of these very methods and *modus operandi* utterly smashed their machinations in respect of the denial of the Traditions, setting at naught all their insidious stratagems with cogent arguments and sound logic.

One cannot but marvel at the elaborate arrangement made by the Divine Being that while it created these sacred means and agents (memorizers and *muḥaddithīn*) who preserved the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*, it informed beforehand of the enemies of *Ḥadīth*, and their stratagems and various ways of denying the Tradition so that the savants of the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth* should remain aware of their designs and craftiness, and should not get entangled in the meshes of their cunning and deception, falsehood and chicanery. In other words, this too was a part of divine guardianship of the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth* that the friends of the two primary bases of religion should be alerted beforehand of these clever enemies thereof.

Divine Strategy and the Negators of the Qur'an and the *Ḥadīth*

The government of a country guarantees its defence, maintains police, sanctions the budget and proclaims punishment for thieves, dacoits and others who spread disorder, still these mischief-mongers and malfactors do not desist from their nefarious activities and due to their innate perversities, continue their subversive and law-breaking pursuits; they are often imprisoned and chastised but this habit has become so ingrained in them that they cannot desist from the temptation of falling into it again and again; their sense of moral values is lost, hence they are incapable of seeing objectively or taking admonition. Thus, while the government is engaged in surveillance, the criminal is out to undo it. In much the same way God guaranteed that He would safeguard the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*. He appointed his own police—the memorizers and *muḥaddithīn*—for this purpose. They were provided victuals and day-to-day expenses from sources nothing short of miraculous.

They were promised His aid which has never failed to come nor will it ever fail to do. For those who interfere with His word and its Exposition, exemplary punishments have been proclaimed. In spite of this, those who are destined from the very beginning for iniquity and have been created for these very crimes, have never desisted nor would ever desist from distorting the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* because due to improper alterations and distortions of the Book of God and *Sunnah*, they have become utterly insensible. They can not hear the voice of truth.

So in spite of the fact that Providence is engaged in the work of safeguarding the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* through the '*ulamā*; they are being belaboured with sound arguments and are again and again bealeaguered by the forces of truth; sound reason and the principles of narraation compel them to suffer humiliating defeat, but their very living depends upon the negation, fabrication and ridiculing of *Ḥadīth*, which they must needs have in any case, and persist in misguiding people. So God Almighty Who in all his Wisdom created Satan with his subversive activities in order to prepare the way for unleashing and strengthening the powers of faith, created likewise the deniers of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* and their evil deeds in order to prepare the way for unfolding the powers of the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth*:

خَلَقَ اللّٰهُ لِلْحُرُوْبِ رِجَالًا وَرِجَالًا لِقَصْعَةٍ وَّ ثَرِيْدٍ

(God has made some men for battle, and some for mere eating and drinking.)

The upshot was that anyone who tried to strike at the twin foundations of the true faith the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*, fell into the pit which he had dug and suffered ignominious defeat. Those classes which negated the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* arose for a limited period and then fell in such a way that no trace of their existence was left at all. But the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* are still as resplendent as ever. The same fate which befell the distorters and fabricators of the *Ḥadīth* shall befall its negators also who expose it to ridicule.

The Correlation between the Qur'an and the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم)

The *ummah* has been blessed with two unique God-given boons: a live Book and a live Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). No one who has an evil intention or possesses a distorted sense can stand in their way. A dead thing can be dealt with as one likes. But leave alone thinking of altering something live, strong and powerful whose guardianship has been assured by a Guarantor, one can not even conceal it from the eyes by raising dust.

لَا يَأْتِيْهِ الْبَاطِلُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَلَا مِنْ
خَلْفِهٖ تَنْزِيْلٌ مِّنْ حَكِيْمٍ حَمِيْدٍ (حٰمٓ السجدہ آیت ۴۲)

Falsehood cannot come at it from before it or from behind it. (It is) a revelation from the Wise, the Owner of Praise.
(Qur'ān, 41:42)

The Quran and its Translation

One of the measures for the preservation of the Qur'ān and its Exposition is that the learned exponents of *Sunnah* translated the Qur'ān in the light of its exposition so that the whole of mankind may be acquainted with it and all nations of the world may easily derive benefit from it in order that the promise by God made to His beloved Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) for the universal preservation of the Qur'ān may find full fulfilment. Muslim scholars and *muḥaddithīn* therefore devoted themselves to the task of translating the Qur'ān in various languages with utmost sense of responsibility, conscientiousness and understanding. Shāh Walī Allāh *Muḥaddith* of Delhi rendered it into Persian. This was followed by the translations of his sons, Shāh Rafī' al-Dīn and Shāh 'Abd al-Qādir, both of whom translated it into Urdu separately. Shāh 'Abd al-Qādir's translation is a remarkable piece of work, as he has tried to catch the real significance and essence of each Qur'ānic word and expression in its Urdu equivalent. Ḥaḍrat Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan *Muḥaddith* Deobandi has reproduced the statement of his teacher, Qāsim al-'Ulūm Ḥujjat al-Islām Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī, founder of the Dār al-'Ulūm, Deoband, to the effect that had the Qur'ān been revealed in Urdu instead of Arabic, its language would have been the same or nearly the same as in this translation.

I am sending these few words at the request of Qāḍī 'Abd al-Raḥmān in the hope that my humble name may also be found among those who stood sentinel for the Qur'ān and its Exposition, the *Ḥadīth*, and these scribbles in black may become luminous by association with the Qur'ān. May my colleagues, friends, and relations share the graces of God for this labour of love!

Muḥammad Ṭayyib
Dār al-'Ulūm Deoband.

* * *

مَقَالَةُ ذِي نُصْحٍ وَ ذَاتُ فَوَائِدٍ — إِذَا مِنْ ذَوِي الْأَلْبَابِ كَانَ اسْتِمَاعُهَا

Accept anything advisory and useful, if heard from the wise.

عَلَيْكُمْ بِآثَارِ النَّبِيِّ فَإِنَّهُ — مِنْ أَفْضَلِ أَعْمَالِ الرَّشَادِ اتِّبَاعُهَا

Make the following of the Prophet of Islam compulsory for yourself, for this is the best of the righteous practices.[1]

وَصَحَّ لِأَهْلِ النَّقْلِ مِنْهَا احْتِجَاجُهُمْ — فَلَمْ يَبْقَ إِلَّا عَانِدٌ وَ حَقُودٌ

Those believing in the Traditional sciences have established the validity of the Prophet's Traditions, so no denier thereof has been left except those malicious opponents whose talk is never free from bias.

وَحَسْبُهُمُ إِنَّ الصَّحَابَةَ بَلَّغُوا — وَ عَنْهُمْ رَوَوْا لَا يُسْتَطَاعُ جُحُودٌ

For them it is quite sufficient that the Companions of the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) have communicated them, and that too on the authority of those who can never be gainsaid.

فَمَنْ حَادَ عَنْ هٰذَا الْيَقِينِ فَخَارِقٌ — مَرِيدٌ لِإِظْهَارِ الشُّكُوكِ مُرِيدٌ

Hence if anyone swerves from what is absolutely certain, he is a refractory opponent of unanimity and intends to create scepticism.

وَلٰكِنْ إِذَا جَاءَ الْهُدٰى وَدَلِيلُهُ — فَلَيْسَ لِمَوْجُودِ الضَّلَالِ وُجُودٌ

But when divine guidance arises with its (irresistible) argument, no trace of obliquity would be left at all.

وَإِنْ رَامَ أَعْدَاءُ الدِّيَانَةِ كَيْدَهَا — فَكَيْدُهُمْ بِالْمُخْزِيَاتِ مَكِيدٌ

And if the enemies of uprightness resolve upon craftiness and chicanery, their cunning would be obliterated by their utter degradation.[2]

---

[1] These two couplets are by Abū 'Umar bin 'Abd al-Barr, author of *Al-Istī'āb fī Ma'rifat al-Aṣḥāb*, who was a contemporary of Khatīb Baghdādī. [2] These five couplets are by Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad bin Fattāḥ, author of *Al-Jama' bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, from his panegyric in praise of Yaḥyā bin Mu'īn.

طَلَبُ العِلْمِ فَرِيْضَةٌ عَلَى كُلِّ مُسْلِمٍ وَّمُسْلِمَةٍ

آغازِ کتاب

ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE IS INCUMBENT UPON ALL MUSLIMS, MALE AND FEMALE.

فھا نحن نشرع فی المقصود بعون الملک المعبود

Now, with the grace of Allāh, we commence the Text of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the translation of the Commentary thereon.

فَضْلُ البَارِی

من شرح

الصَّحِیح لِلامام البُخاری

للعلّامة المغفور له الشّیخ الثقة شبّیر احمد العُثمانی

الملقب بشیخ الاسلام فی باکستان

ھذبه وعلق علیه

فَضِیلة العلّامة الشیخ القاضی عبد الرحمٰن

مُدیر مسئُول النشر لادارة العُلوم الشرعیّة

شارع نشتر کراتشی باکستان

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful

اَلْحَمْدُ لِلّٰهِ وَالصَّلٰوةُ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلٰى رَسُوْلِهٖ مُحَمَّدٍ وَّاٰلِهٖ وَصَحْبِهٖ

(Praise be to Allāh and blessings of God and peace be upon the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*), his Progeny and Companions)

Narrated Al-Shaykh Al-Imām Ḥāfiẓ Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad bin Ismā'il bin Ibrāhīm bin Al-Mughīrah Al-Bukhārī (*raḥmat ullāh 'alaih*). Amen.

قَالَ الشَّيْخُ الْاِمَامُ الْحَافِظُ اَبُوْعَبْدِ اللّٰهِ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ اِسْمٰعِيْلَ بْنِ اِبْرَاهِيْمَ بْنِ الْمُغِيْرَةِ الْبُخَارِيُّ رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ تَعَالٰى اٰمِيْنَ۔

كِتَابُ الوحى

BOOK OF REVELATION

How *waḥī* (Revelation) started descending on the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). And the saying of Allāh: Indeed, We have revealed to you as We have revealed to Noah (*Nūḥ*) and the Prophets after him.

بَابٌ كَيْفَ كَانَ بَدْءُ الْوَحْيِ اِلٰى رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَقَوْلُ اللّٰهِ تَعَالٰى عَزَّ وَجَلَّ اِنَّا اَوْحَيْنَا اِلَيْكَ كَمَا اَوْحَيْنَا اِلٰى نُوْحٍ وَّالنَّبِيِّيْنَ مِنْ بَعْدِهٖ

The Peculiar Manner of Imam Bukhari in Commencing This Book

Writers usually commence their writings with the praise of God and invoking His blessings on the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه), however, commenced his book in a manner different from the conventional. This gives rise to a difficulty about Bukhārī's method whichs eems to be at variance with the instructions given by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in this behalf. Let us, therefore, see the *Aḥādīth* which raise this difficulty about Bukhārī's work. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has said :

1. Every important deed that does not begin with the *dhikr* (Remembrance) of God and *Bismillāh* (In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful) remains imperfect.

كُلُّ اَمْرٍ ذِيْ بَالٍ لَمْ يُبْدَءْ فِيْهِ بِذِكْرِ اللّٰهِ وَبِبِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ فَهُوَ اَقْطَعُ۔

According to Abū Dā'ūd and Nisā'ī the words used in the Tradition are:

2. Every statement that does not begin with the praise of God is faulty.

كُلُّ كَلَامٍ لَمْ يُبْدَءْ فِيْهِ بِحَمْدِ اللّٰهِ فَهُوَ اَجْذَمُ۔

The text of the Tradition, according to Ibn Mājah is as follows :

3. Every important deed that is not commenced with the praise of God remains imperfect.

كُلُّ اَمْرٍ ذِيْ بَالٍ لَمْ يُبْدَءْ فِيْهِ بِالْحَمْدِ فَهُوَ اَقْطَعُ۔

In view of the above Traditions, it has been said that Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) should not have commenced his book merely with the words "In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful." He should have first praised God and invoked blessings on the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), particularly because God has commenced His Book with His own praise. The question, therefore, arises as to why Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) has disregarded these considerations.

Replies to the Objection

Some writers have replied on behalf of the Imām that the Tradition referred to does not satisfy the standard and conditions prescribed by him for the reliability of the Traditions because it has been transmitted by Qurah bin 'Abd al-Raḥmān whose reliability cannot be vouched for. Therefore Bukhārī has ignored it. This reply is extremely unsound and not in keeping with Bukhārī's status as a connoisseur of Traditions. In the first place, Nisā'ī's report establishes that Qurah bin 'Abd al-Raḥmān is not the only transmitter of this Tradition, for it has also been transmitted by a subsequent reporter, Sa'īd bin 'Abd al-'Azīz. Even if not reported by a person of the succeeding generation, it is obvious that a report which enjoins a pious act does not require to be examined very critically. It seems, therefore, inappropriate to give this reason for Bukhārī's indifference to this triform Tradition. Moreover, the Tradition does satisfy some of the tests that have been prescribed by certain connoisseurs of Traditions. For instance, (1) if all the reporters of a Tradition are reliable so that it is accepted to be true for practical purposes, and one of the reporters is unreliable but a later one supports it; (2) it is included in authentic compilations and even one of the great connoisseurs declares it to be authentic, and (3) all its reporters are just and sound, then it ought to be accepted as authentic. The present Tradition fulfils these conditions because it is included in authentic collections of Traditions by Ibn Khuzaymah and Ibn Ḥabbān who profess to select only those *Aḥādīth* which fulfil their conditions of authenticity. Moreover the status of this *Ḥadīth* comes out fully when a connoisseur like Ibn Ṣalāḥ has praised and invested it with approval.

Some writers have said that the common feature of all these versions is that God's blessings must be invoked when commencing any work. There is not any set manner of remembering God. It should be sufficient if we said: "بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم" "In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful" when commencing any work. The remembrance of Allāh is something general and الحمد لله (praise of God) and بسم الله (commencing with the name of Allāh) are only forms thereof. There are writers who hold that according to the Traditions an undertaking should be commenced with "بسم الله" (In the name of Allāh) or "الحمدلله" (All praise is for Allāh). So Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) has fulfilled this obligation by using the words "In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful" because the beginning has been made with the name of God, and the adjectives, "the Compassionate, the Merciful" constitute His praise as well since both of these are God's sublime attributes. And it is an admitted fact that for God's praise it is not necessary that the expression "حمد" (praise) should be used, for there are so many other ways of God's praise and exaltation as well.

Some writers have argued that the words used in the Tradition are "لم يبد", "does not begin", and not "لم يكتب", "does not write". It is, therefore, not necessary to write down the praise of God; its utterance before undertaking a task is sufficient. If that is so, then why should we entertain a suspicion about Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) that he began to write this book without praising God ? It is reported about Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal (رحمة الله عليه) that whenever in the course of writing the Prophet's name came up he used to recite درود (invoking God's blessings) with his tongue only. It has been held by some writers that by commencing the Book with *Bismillāh*, Bukhārī has but followed the Book of God because the first verse of the Holy Qur'ān was commenced with the words "اقرا باسم ربک" (Read in the name of thy God).

The Best Answer to the Objection

The best answer befitting the high status of Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) is that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has adopted different modes in his sayings. Some began with the words "بحمد الله", "With the praise of Allāh", and some with "بسم الله", "In the name of Allāh". On closely scrutinizing the Prophet's practice, we find that he used to begin his sermons with "الحمدلله نحمده", "All praise is for Allāh; we praise Allāh" and his writings with بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم (In the Name of Allāh...). Evidence of the latter is provided by his epistles to the kings and emperors of his time. He adopted the same mode in the document of truce at Ḥudaybiyah about which the unbelievers had objected that they did not know of any *Raḥmān* (Compassionate) or *Raḥīm* (Merciful). Similar appears to have been the practice of the earlier prophets too. The extraordinarily eloquent and overawing letter of Prophet Sulaymān (عليه السلام) which made even a majestic person like Bilqīs, the Queen of Shebā, tremble and which has been reproduced *verbatim* in the Qur'ān, began similarly. It commenced with the words : بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم "In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful." The actual words are :

Lo! it is from Sulaymān and lo! it is
In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively
Compassionate, Extremely Merciful.
(Qur'ān, 27:30)

إِنَّهُ مِنْ سُلَيْمٰنَ وَإِنَّهُ بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

The above answer has been set down in Zarqānī's commentary on *Muwaṭṭā*. It is, therefore, clear that the manner in which Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) has begun this book is in total conformity with the Holy Prophet's manner. Only he who is ignorant of the high position of Bukhārī in the science of the Tradition would question its validity.

"How Revelation descended بَابٌ كَيْفَ كَانَ بَدْءُ الْوَحْيِ إِلَى رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ upon the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)".

There are three ways in which we can read the words employed by Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه): (i) "باب كيف كان" (*bābun kayfa kāna*), (ii) "باب كيف كان" (*bābu kayfa kāna*) and (iii) "باب كيف كان" (*bāb kayfa kāna*). In the first event the text would be as follows : "هذا باب فى جواب كيف" (This chapter is in reply to the query: How ?).

According to this manner of reading, the purpose would be to explain how the *Aḥādīth* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) have reached us, what are the media of their transmission to us, and how this chain started. The basic purpose would not be to delineate the mode of commencement of revelation but to deal with the relevant Traditions only. In this connexion a particular thing, pertaining to the commencement of the descent of *waḥī*, was conspicuously set forth. But this is only a part of the heading and not its real purpose. Once we bear this point in mind, we should be able to understand the relevance of every Tradition tabulated to the chapter without any elaborate explanation or the necessity of finding the connexion of everyone of these Traditions with the commencement of *waḥī*. In fact, search of this nature would be beyond the object Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) had in mind. However, it is necessary that every Tradition should pertain to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the *waḥī*, since this is what the chapter is about.

The second manner of reading the heading is "هذا باب فى جواب كيف" "This is the chapter on the condition in which revelation came." In this case, it seems the object of the chapter is to describe the state of the descent of revelation. But if we scan all the reports contained in this chapter we find only one Tradition in support thereof, that by Ḥaḍrat 'Āiyshah (رضى الله عنها), in respect of the descent of revelation. All the other Traditions are silent on this point which compels us to devise some subtle explanation.

The third mode of reading is not different from the other two in connotation.

Imam Bukhari's Headings

Headings are, in general, tantamount to an assertion and the *Aḥādīth* presented thereunder substantiate this assertion. It often happens that the apposition between a *ḥadīth* and its caption, that is the assertion and the proof thereof, is clearly perceptible. But even if this is otherwise, the status of Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) is not such that despite our lack of understanding we should unwarrantedly start finding fault with him. The ingenuity of the commentators of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* lies in this that they establish concord between a *ḥadīth* and its heading. Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) has not indicated anything about the headings. The commentators themselves examined the *aḥādīth* he has reproduced and, according to their own good sense, determined their purport. That is why the determination of the purport of the headings has caused much difference of opinion among the commentators.

Introduction to the Different Works on Bukhari's Headings

Whole books have been written for the elucidation of the headings of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Nāṣir al-Dīn bin Munīr has written the *Kitāb al-Mutawāzī 'alā Tarājim al-Bukhārī*. Similarly Ibn Rashīd has written the *Tarjumān al-Tarājim*. Speaking of Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) in his *Prolegomena*, Ibn Khaldūn has said that although numerous commentaries of his book have appeared, but his debt is yet to be paid, for no one has been able to indemnify it so far. 'Allāmah Shams al-Dīn Sakhāwī, a brilliant pupil of Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, who had a great love for his teacher, has written in his book, *Al-Ḍaw al-Lāmi' fī 'A'yān al-Qarn al-Tāsi'* (The light of the Great Luminary of the Ninth Century), in reply to Ibn Khaldūn that his teacher, Ibn Ḥajar, has paid back the debt in full and thus absolved the *ummah* from its burden. 'Allāmah 'Aynī has also written a comprehensive commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, but to speak the truth, it stands no comparison with the *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, the commentary on it by Ibn Ḥajar. The debt has been really paid by Ibn Ḥajar. I deeply appreciate what 'Allāmah Shams al-Dīn Sakhāwī has said, but I feel that a part of the debt remains to be paid. The debt of the elucidation of the *Aḥādīth* has indeed been paid but that of the Headings is still outstanding. Shāh Walī Allāh *Muḥaddith* Dehlawī wrote a treatise published by the *Dā'iratul Ma'ārif*, Hyderabad, on Bukhārī's Headings. Shāh Walī Allāh is an acknowledged Imām of his age. My revered teacher and mentor, Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā

Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan, rendered two services during his incarceration in Malta: a translation of the Qur'ān and the elucidations of some headings of Bukhārī. Although he taught the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* thirty-five times but he could not complete the work on the Headings.

Headings : An Index to Bukhari's Sciences

It is said that "فقه البخاری فی تراجمه" "the jurisprudence of Bukhārī is contained in his Headings". This has been taken to mean by some that although Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله علیه) is himself a *Mujtahid* yet he has not written a full-fledged book on juristic problems and has embodied them in different Headings of the *Ṣaḥīḥ*. These people have taken the words *fiqh* in its technical sense, that is, jurisprudence. The expression actually means *tafaqquh* (learning). What is meant is that the keen understanding of Bukhārī is evident from the Headings of the chapters in which he abstracts juristic problems in very subtle and curiously suggestive ways thereby reaching heights which even the most highly accomplished savants cannot reach. Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله علیه) has incorporated numerous sciences in these Headings. Very often it so happens that the Imām puts down a heading but its purport has seemingly no connexion whatsoever with its outward aspects. On the other hand, he holds some symbolic purport in his mind and tabulates the *Aḥādīth* accordingly. In these circumstances it is difficult to determine their purport from the apparent signification. Sometimes the headings are not in the nature of assertions but only indicative. Those gifted with a keen analytical sense are able to grasp their significance. At times, having in view the difference in opinion of the leading scholars, Bukhārī does not give the heading in the usual manner but in the form of an interrogation and sets forth the *Aḥādīth* accordingly. The object is that the scope should come out, no matter whether his stance is accepted or not. On other occasions the heading is given in order to point to the explanation and nature of a particular *ḥadīth* and on still other occasions he adopts the synthetic approach of first presenting the different narrations and then reconciling them. Whenever such situations arise, we shall discuss all these matters in detail.

Heading and its Elucidation

One term current in the science of the Traditions is that the portion from the heading to the actual *ḥadīth* commenced with "حدثنا" (Narrated to us) is called *tarjuma-tul-bāb* (heading) and also *mutarjam bihī*, (keynote). What follows after "حدثنا" is known as *mutarjam lahū* (that for which the heading has been set forth). *Lām* (*la*) denotes the cause, because the heading is substantiated by the *Aḥādīth* that follow owing to which this superscription has been given. The heading takes its cue from the *ḥadīth*; hence there should be some relevancy between them. What we should remember is that it is not essential that each and every *ḥādīth* reproduced under the *tarjuma-tul-bāb* should be exactly related to every part of the latter; even one word that conforms to the chapter should suffice. Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله علیه) very often includes many things in the *tarjuma-tul-bāb* but the *ḥadīth* which he reproduces fits in with only one. This is the real object of the heading; the remaining are there because of the relatively less important association for additional enlightenment.

Many believe that each and every *ḥadīth* should accord with the heading. This view is not shared by scholars. They believe that, if the *Aḥādīth* on the whole fulfil the purpose, this should be deemed sufficient. Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) is in the habit of bringing a clearly relevant *ḥadīth* under some heading and then reproducing another not directly relevant to the heading but as an elaborate elucidation of the first, or related to it in some other way. If, therefore, one *ḥadīth* corresponds to the heading but the others are related to this *ḥadīth* only, even then the heading would be substantiated. The easiest way to correlate the heading and the illustration is that whenever the heading does not seem to accord with the *ḥadīth*, actual words of the former should be carefully studied, followed by a close examination of the *ḥadīth*, and the common denominator sought out which should be considered the real intent of the heading, and the correspondence of the *Aḥādīth* should be sought with reference to it.

Why Commencement of the Book with Mention of Revelation?

It is the practice of *muḥaddithīn* to commence their books with a distinctive subject which in their opinion should constitute the crux of the matter. Some have commenced their works with a chapter on faith. Ibn Mājah of Qazwīn has commenced his book with holding fast to the *Sunnah*, giving the impression thereby that Islam is nothing but the way and practice of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and for the perpetuation of the essence thereof, a clear distinction between the *Sunnah* and heresy is essential. Abū Dā'ūd and Tirmidhī (رحمهما الله) begin their books with ablution and matters relating to bodily cleanliness, for such an important form of prayer as the *ṣalāt* depends on them. Imām Mālik (رحمة الله عليه) initiates the *Muwaṭṭa* with the timings observed for prayers, as the latter depend upon the fixation of a time-schedule. Imām Muslim (رحمة الله عليه) makes the problems of *isnād* (authority) the introductory theme, as the *Sunnah* is the very base of Islam and distinction between authoritative and apocryphal Traditions is dependent on the nature of the *isnād*.

Imām Bukhārī's approach is entirely different. He takes up the theme of the beginning of revelation first before he moves on to faith, although faith is the fundamental thing and faith in the unity of God is still more so. If we discover Bukhārī's intent, many difficulties will be resolved. What he has in mind is that, whatever is narrated cannot be authentic unless it bears relation to revelation. And, when everything is bound up with it, the first pre-requisite is to acknowledge its majesty, sanctity, truth and augustness. Once the trustworthy nature of revelation is acknowledged, everyone shall have to acknowledge whatever is associated with it. The way Bukhārī has begun his subject, this conviction lends all the more strength to the belief that the soundness and trustworthiness of everything is bound up with the sublimity of revelation. Thus the chapter on how the descent of revelation commenced is merely the introductory part of the book; the real book starts with the Book on Faith. The Imām has pointed in a preliminary manner that his book will be authoritative only if it is related to revelation. Once the genesis of revelation, its truth and sublimity are accepted without reservation, the whole book shall be acceptable. Some *muḥaddithīn* believe that by starting with the subject of revelation, Bukhārī intended to show that the relationship between God and man stems from revelation and this reality establishes the relationship of man with God, and also that this relation demands knowledge and action. Imām Bukhārī has indicated this point through the arrangement of the chapters. The chapters on revelation are followed by those on knowledge, after which a detailed survey of actions is made.

Concordance between the Chapter on the Commencement of Revelation and the *Aḥādīth* reproduced thereunder

The problem here is that, while the chapter is apparently concerned with the elucidation of the commencement of revelation, some *Aḥādīth* do not feature it at all, and others which mention it, say nothing about the beginning of the descent of revelation. Just one *ḥadīth* speaks of its commencement, that is, the one reported by Ḥaḍrat 'Āiyshah (رضی الله عنها) but others do not relate anything about a particular type of commencement. The first *ḥadīth* is "انما الاعمال بالنيات" "Verily deeds depend upon intentions." Here there is no mention of revelation. The second *ḥadīth* mentions it but not its beginning. The *ḥadīth* pertaining to Hiraqal[1] also does not point to the commencement of *waḥī* but dwells upon the moral character and excellences of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). Some have countered this apparent discrepancy by pointing out that relevance is not necessary; since these *Aḥādīth* derive from revelation, they have been reproduced here. This answer is very faulty because, if this were so, then all the *Aḥādīth* should have been reproduced, based as they are on revelation, for it has been said: "وما ينطق عن الهوىٰ ان هو الا وحی يوحىٰ" "Nor doth he speak of (his own) desire. It is naught save an inspiration that is inspired." (Qur'ān 53:3-4)

Shah Wali Allah's Viewpoint

Shāh Walī Allāh has suggested that the word *waḥī* (revelation) has been employed in a general sense, whether recited and preserved word for word, as in the Qur'ān, or the subject of the *ḥadīth* is based on revelation, as are all *Aḥādīth* of the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) because whatever proceeds from God is truth and right. The non-recited revelation is also a part of Imām Bukhārī's overall purpose, as his object is the affirmation of the *Aḥādīth*. The word *waḥī*, again, is infinitive gender which gives rise to two possibilities. Either it is intended to be in the sense of a verbal noun, that is *īḥā* which is borne out by the Qur'ān: "الا وحياً او من وراء حجاب" "Unless (it be) by revelation or from behind a veil" (42:51) or it has been employed as a passive participle, that is, *mūḥā* (that which is explained by means of *waḥī* or revelation.) This also occurs in the Qur'ān: "الا وحی يوحیٰ" "save an inspiration that is inspired." (53:4) Shāh Walī Allāh has explained the matter in the light of both these possibilities. Examining the first he has said that the words *kayfa* and *bada'a*—the latter is the governing noun of *waḥī*—are not the real intent of Imām Bukhārī's heading, but, that noun which follows the genitive that is *waḥī*, meaning *īḥā*. What he wants to establish is that the *waḥī* came to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) from God. Neither the word *kayfa* (condition) nor *bada'a* are the object of the heading. Since in the *ḥadīth* reported by Ḥaḍrat 'Āiyshah (رضی الله عنها), the condition of the commencement of *waḥī* has been mentioned, in the words "اول ما بدی" it has been mentioned in the heading also for additional enlightenment.

As the object of the heading is only to prove *īḥā* (revelation) and not to etch out the characteristic of the commencement of *waḥī*, whichever *ḥadīth* mentions anything about *waḥī* would be relevant to it.

As regards the second possibility, *Shāh Walī Allāh* has said that the word *mūḥā* (that which has been transmitted as *waḥī* or revelation) means a collection of *waḥīs*. How did this collection of revelation come into existence, where did it come from, and how did it reach us ? To this, our reply would be: through *'ulamā* (savants) of unimpeachable veracity, possessed of proverbial integrity, whom it reached from the Prophet's Companions possessing probity. The Companions received it straight from the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) who received it from the Angel Jibra'īl whose veracity is testified by his appellation "روح الامین" "Trusty Spirit" and "رسول کریم" "the honoured Messenger" who brought it from God the Almighty, the Ultimate Source of all knowledge.

---

[1] The Arabicised form of Heracleus, the father of Constan II.

The *Aḥādīth* of this chapter bear out all this.

Shāh Walī Allāh prefers the second sense. For he says in his "*Manhiyyah*" that to his mind "کیف بدأ و من این جاء و من ای جهة وقع" "how did *waḥī* commence and from what place and what direction it came to us"? has precedence. Thus he has laid more emphasis on the word *waḥī* which is the genitive noun and not *bada'a* which is governing noun although he has paid some attention to it also as is apparent from the words first quoted. They point somewhat to generalisation, although not in a wholesale manner.

Mawlana Mahmud al-Hasan's View

That is why Shaykh al-Hind Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan has retained all this commentary of Shāh Walī Allāh with some amendment and modification. As Shāh Walī Allāh has taken the word *waḥī* in the general sense, so does the Shaykh al-Hind take the word *bada'a*; thus the words how did *waḥī* commence, would mean "what is its source (*mabda'*)?" Obviously there are several factors involved in it all constituting its origin, namely (i) *mabda' fā'ilī* (active originator), putting the question as to who set it into motion and who is its source?; (ii) *mabda' maf'ūlī* (Passive Agent), that is, on whom did it first descend? ; (iii) *mabda' zamānī* (When did it come ?); (iv) *mabda' makānī* (From where did it commence ?), and (v) *mabda' ba-i'tibār asbāb* (What were the causes behind it ?). Similarly anything else can also have numerous originating factors, as is evident from other sciences too. For instance, fifteen disciplines have been called the sources of *tafsīr*—the science of the interpretation of the Qur'ān. In the same way, *waḥī*, which is a momentous and positive thing can have numerous origins from different operative causes. One of these is the Real Doer (God) who is the *muḥī* (Revealer). He is the Sacred, Exalted and Omniscient Being about whom imagining even the slightest negligence means heresy. The second is the Angel Jibra'īl who is the means of transmitting *waḥī* to this world, the universe of cause and effect; to whom *waḥī* and its impartation and iteration have been attributed again and again, and whose veracity and integrity have been pointed by God the Almighty in the following words:

That this is in truth the word of an honoured messenger, mighty, established in the presence of the Lord of the Throne, (one) to be obeyed, and trustworthy. (Qur'ān, 81:19-21)	إِنَّهُ لَقَوْلُ رَسُولٍ كَرِيمٍ ذِي قُوَّةٍ عِنْدَ ذِي الْعَرْشِ مَكِينٍ مُطَاعٍ ثَمَّ أَمِينٍ (التکویر، آیت ۱۹ تا ۲۱)

The purport of the whole passage is that the Angel Jibra'īl is the envoy deputed by God the Omnipotent and has an exalted status as God Himself has said:

Allāh chooseth from the angels messengers, and (also) from mankind. Lo ! Allāh is the Hearer, Seer. (Qur'ān, 22:75)	اَللّٰهُ يَصْطَفِي مِنَ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةِ رُسُلًا وَّمِنَ النَّاسِ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ سَمِيعٌ بَصِيرٌ (الحج، آیت ۷۵)

This means that God chooses the most trustworthy person to convey His message. The attribute of the Angel Jibra'īl has been described as *karīm* (honoured), which means that he is an embodiment of excellence.

He has been called "ذی قوه" that is, a personality so powerful that if he brings a revelation it is impossible that anyone should intercept him. The nunnation (*tanwīn*) in *quwwatin* "قوه" emphasizes his majesty so that even if all the evil powers in the cosmos joined together to seize or intercept the message, they would fail. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has described the power of the Angel by telling how he lifted the habitations of the people of the Prophet Lūt (Lot) (عليه السلام) along with them towards the sky on a single wing and dashed them to the ground. His power can be judged from the fact that when he was asked as to whether he had ever felt any discomfort, he replied that when the brothers of the Prophet Yūsuf (Joseph) (عليه السلام) threw him into a well by snapping the cord, and he (Jibra'īl) was commanded by God to see that he should not let him fall into water, he swooped down from the *Sidrat ul-Muntahā* and caught him before he fell. The words "عند ذی العرش مکین" mean that he enjoys a lofty position near God on High, that is he lives in an eminent place, not on earth, hence he faces no danger whatsoever of any change or affectability. *Mutā'in* "مطاع" means his commands are obeyed and he is the chief of a big host.

Then there is another complement—the venue of revelation—the personality of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) who is the recepient of the *waḥī*. Hence Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) has to describe the qualities of the receiving complement also.

Another origin relates to the place where the *waḥī* descended, that is the cave named Hirā. Still another pertains to the time when revelation commenced—forty years after the Year of the Elephant.[1] One more origin is: who was the first recepient of *waḥī*? Then what type of *waḥī* first descended on the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)? Again, the reason for which a person was made the recepient of revelation, as such a person should be characterised by the possession of extraordinary natural gifts, high morals, admirable attributes and praiseworthy living. It is evident that not everyone can be given the rank of prophethood. When Allāh appoints anyone as a prophet it is incumbent upon everyone to obey him, however wise or highly placed he might be. Never mind how rich a man might be or devoted to God, he is bound to obey him. Evidently, only that person is fit for being a prophet who is the primus of his age, such that no one feels any hesitation in following him. He is the most perfect man of his time such that all his statements, acts, speech and conduct are worthy of following. There are also other characteristics or attributes which make him unique, for instance, resignation to the Will of God, independence from other human beings, and charge of his duties as prophet. In sum, all these constitute the essentials for the descent of revelation, as has been specifically mentioned in the *ḥadīth* relating to Hiraqal,[2] and then these attributes have been acknowledged through the lips of an enemy: "الفضل ماشهدت به الاعداء" "The real excellence is that which is testified by enemies." Shaykh al-Hind used to say: "You will appreciate all the more what I have said when you consider why Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) began his book with the commencement of *waḥī*."

---

[1] That is, 40 years after Abrahah, King of Yemen, who undertook an expedition against Makkah in the year of the birth of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).

[2] In which Heracleus remarked : "If I knew I could get to him, I would like to meet him, and if I were with him, I would wash his feet. His kingdom will certainly reach to what is under my feet." (*Bukhārī* and *Muslim*)

Prophethood is Bestowed, not Acquired.

What we have described as the qualities of the recepient of revelation and the perfection of his attributes might make someone think that, on these counts, prophethood would be something that can be acquired. Hence here too the Mu'tazilites misunderstood that prophethood can be acquired just like *wilāyat* (mystical communion). But the fact is that prophethood is God-given, not acquirable. I would explain it thus that prophethood is a rank and not a degree whereas *wilāyat* is really an academic degree. No doubt noble attributes constitute an essential part of the requisites of revelation, but there are some conditions precedent for its descent. Prophethood is granted by God but it is based upon those attributes and qualities which have been partly discussed above. Even if a man happens to live for thousands of years and devotes his whole life to worship, committing not even a minor sin, he cannot acquire prophethood by personal endeavour. Only he whom God grants it, gets it unasked. Thus one is a rank and the other a degree or qualification that prepares one to receive that rank. The government would grant a rank only to one holding that degree. Anyone who passes an examination can acquire the degree, but he is not competent to acquire the rank; only he can get it whom the government chooses.

And when a token cometh unto them, they say: We will not believe till we are given that which Allāh's messengers are given. Allāh knoweth best with whom to place His message. (Qur'ān, 6:125)

وَإِذَا جَآءَتْهُمْ اٰيَةٌ قَالُوا لَنْ نُّؤْمِنَ حَتّٰى نُؤْتٰى مِثْلَ مَآ اُوْتِىَ رُسُلُ اللّٰهِ ۘ اَللّٰهُ اَعْلَمُ حَيْثُ يَجْعَلُ رِسَالَتَهٗ ؕ (انعام آیت ۱۲۵)

But Allāh (Himself) testifieth concerning that which He hath revealed unto thee, in his knowledge hath He revealed it. (Qur'ān, 4:166)

لٰكِنِ اللّٰهُ يَشْهَدُ بِمَآ اَنْزَلَ اِلَيْكَ اَنْزَلَهٗ بِعِلْمِهٖ ۚ (نساء، آیت ۱۶۶)

"*Bi-'ilmihī*" "بعلمه" has been explained by some as a special type of knowledge having been conserved in the Qur'ān, and the sciences and verities which have been derived from the Qur'ān or will continue to be drawn from it and have not been drawn from any other book. Others have explained it by saying that Allāh has sent His last Book knowingly and deliberately. He knows well if someone has the capacity to bear His trust or not. This second interpretation accords with "الله اعلم حيث يجعل رسالته" "Allāh knows how his apostleship emanated". It is a fact that, despite prophethood being endowed by God, its conferment depends upon some pre-requisites. It is *apropos* of this very capacity that God has said in respect of the Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام):

And when he reached his full strength and was ripe, We gave him wisdom and knowledge. (Qur'ān, 28:14)

وَلَمَّا بَلَغَ اَشُدَّهٗ وَاسْتَوٰىٓ اٰتَيْنٰهُ حُكْمًا وَّعِلْمًا ؕ (قصص، آیت ۱۴)

Similarly, about Prophet Yusuf (عليه السلام) it has been said:

And, when he reached his prime We gave him wisdom and knowledge. (Qur'ān, 12:22)

وَلَمَّا بَلَغَ اَشُدَّهٗٓ اٰتَيْنٰهُ حُكْمًا وَّعِلْمًا (یوسف، آیت ۲۲)

These two *āyāt* prove both the facts of prophethood being conferred by God and the presence of its pre-requisites and complements.

The End of Prophethood.

If the government abolishes any department, then no one would aspire to any office in it. God ended prophethood with the Holy

Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) who said, "If there had been any prophet after me, it would have been 'Umar." There must have been some special quality in 'Umar because of which the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said this.

Rational for Beginning with Revelation.

There are various ways and means of acquiring knowledge and establishing verity. The Greek philosophers considered rational suppositions as sure avenues of knowledge and verity, while the prime *mujtahids* resorted to the exercise of judicious deliberation, and the gnostics and, *ṣūfīs* to intuitive perception and clairvoyance. One means of epistemology are the five physical senses which are common to all. But none of these is free or immune from error. All are liable to err; in fact this has been actually observed. This is the reason why all those employing these means are at variance with one another. For instance, take the philosophers; how they contradict and falsify one another. There is perhaps not a single point on which all of them agree; so much so that they differ even about observable phenomena. Some say that substance is composed of forms; others hold that it consists of indivisible particles and still others like Democretes that it is compounded of infinitesinal particles. Similarly, if we turn to the prime jurists, their differences are all too obvious, but even among the *ṣūfīs* there are some who contradict one another; there is clash and confrontation between their intuitive perceptions and mystic visions. Sometimes their monitions are Satanic and sometimes Divine. In the first place it is often hard to differentiate between them. Sometimes the monitions of a mystic are mixed up with his whims and fancies. At others the intimations are misunderstood because they are not pre-conditioned by infallibility like the revelations of a prophet. The great Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī contradicts many theses advanced by Imām Ghazālī and, *apropos of* the doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* (Unity of Being), generally known as Pantheism, says : "خطا کرده و از صواب دورافتاده" "He committed an error and went astray."

Even the Companions of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) have differed in matters of novation so much so that the opinion of one clashed with that of the other's leading to civil war. And wherever there is mutual contradiction and falsification, one side is bound to be wrong; otherwise it would lead to a piling up of contradictory matters.

In a like manner our senses also err. For instance a squint-eyed person sees double images while some find a sweet thing bitter. This shows that our senses can commit an error because of some discrepancy. In fact there are some situations where everyone of us registers a wrong sensation. For instance, when we see the flakes of clouds at a fast speed during a moon-lit night, we feel the moon hurrying forward. The stars appear to us infinitesimally small because of the stupendous distance, although as a matter of fact, our planet has no size to boast of beside theirs. Similarly, today all scientists agree that the earth is bouncing away at the rate of thousands of miles per minute, which gives rise to the phenomena of night and day, rising and setting of the sun. However sharp-sighted a person might be his eyes will tell him that the earth is stationary. No one since the dawn of the world, has actually seen the earth move. Hence the scientists say that our sense of sight is at fault and its observations are rectified by the intellect. In the same way, the sensibility of one man may be at variance with that of another at one and the same time and in the same circumstances, as we see day and night. One person, being more sensitive, can smell even a slightly foul smell while another sitting at the same table, cannot feel it.

It is, therefore, evident that all the methods and modes of acquiring knowledge and ratiocination adopted by all the schools are liable to errors. None is immune from it. Where the senses err, the intellect can point out the error. But we find that even the intellect can commit a mistake, as is shown by the differences of opinion among philosophers. So someone impervious to error should guide the intellect also, otherwise there would be a never-ending chain of errors. This can be revelation only, which is not liable to error because its fountainhead God Almighty is infallible. Then the bringer of the message is an angel. The unquestioning obedience by angels to God's commands has been described as follows:

(They) resist not Allāh in that which He commandeth them, but do that which they are commanded. (Qur'ān, 66:6)

لَا يَعْصُوْنَ اللّٰهَ مَآ اَمَرَهُمْ وَيَفْعَلُوْنَ مَا
يُؤْمَرُوْنَ (التحریم آیت ۶)

Further, the descent of revelation is accompanied by most meticulously devised measures to ensure its safety. The moment the Angel Jibra'īl starts on his journey earthward with the revelation, he is accompanied by thousands of angels. There are certain *Aḥādīth* which state that no less than seventy thousand angels accompanied him in the transmission of some *āyāt*. Even if he had been alone, there would have been no danger whatsoever. But being not alone, there is no question of any interference from anywhere because so many angels are deputed with him; so that evil powers like Satan etc. should not interpolate anything in the revelatory matter to which the following *surah* has alluded:

And then He maketh a guard to go before him and a guard behind him. (Qur'ān, 72:27)

فَاِنَّهٗ يَسْلُكُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَمِنْ خَلْفِهٖ رَصَدًا (جن آیت ۲۷)

This is why it has been said:

With truth have We sent it down, and with truth hath it descended, (Qur'ān, 17:105)

بِالْحَقِّ اَنْزَلْنٰهُ وَبِالْحَقِّ نَزَلَ ط (بنی اسرائیل، آیت ۱۰۵)

Difference in *Sharī'ahs* does not mean difference in Revelation.

A misgiving might arise that revelation also is not free from conflict as is evident from difference in the *sharī'ahs* of various prophets. It was argued in cases of difference of opinion in other matters that one of them must be wrong. The same, it would be urged, holds good in the case of *sharī'ahs* also.

The reply to this is that this difference is not of that type, because *sharī'ahs* of all the prophets, right from the beginning upto the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), are agreed about fundamentals and there are differences only in subsidiary matters. These differences are just like different medicines prescribed by a physician from time to time for a patient according to the different states of his health. It cannot be said that the first prescription was wrong. Everyone would say it suited the patient at that time while the present one suits him now.

Similarly, it is the conviction of every prophet, and he inculcates his people to believe likewise, that all *sharī'ahs* are true and in consonance with what was suitable in their own time. This point has been mentioned thus in the Qur'ān:

And who believe in that which is revealed unto thee (Muḥammad) and that which was revealed before thee. (Qur'ān, 2:4)

وَالَّذِيْنَ يُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِمَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكَ وَمَآ
اُنْزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ ج (بقرہ آیت ۴)

Similarly, belief in the prophethood of all has been enjoined:

We make no distinction between any of His messengers. (Qur'ān, 2:285)	لَا نُفَرِّقُ بَيْنَ اَحَدٍ مِّنْ رُّسُلِهٖ (بقرہ آیت ۲۸۵)

There are such numerous *āyāt* which inculcate this. It is impossible for a prophet to contradict or falsify the message of another, as is the case with different sects; in fact they never belie or contradict one another. Thus "فظهر الفرق واندفع الاشكال" the difference has become manifest and the complexity has been removed.

Thus we reach the conclusion that only *waḥī* can be regarded as infallible and all other sources of knowledge and verity are not free from the possibility of error. Therefore no other thing except *waḥī* or anything deriving its authority from it can have an authoritative stance. That is why it is said that surmise is not confirmatory of behests but only a manifestation thereof. However great an *imām* might be, if he says anything according to his own opinion and novation, without seeking authority from revelation, it would not have any validity in matters of faith. But it must be borne in mind that the novation of a prophet has a binding force because it is an established fact that a prophet is never left to continue with an error but the lapse is rectified by revelation. But novation must be distinguished from mere opinion or saying something by way of advice. This point was understood by Barīrah in her wish to separate from Mughīth. She told the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم): "O Prophet of God, if this is your command, then I accept it with my heart and soul. But if it merely happens to be your personal opinion or advice, then I do not like Mughīth." That is what happened in the case of the incident of Tābīr Nakhlah also. So whatever Bukhārī would say from the Book of Faith to the end of the book shall comprise *Aḥādīth* derived from this very *waḥī*, the same that brought light of guidance into a world plunged in darkness, and transformed it in such a manner as to give it a new complexion altogether. The revelation which has performed such a momentous work, its causal factors and antecedents, the exalted status of the recepient of revelation, his noble attributes because of which he was crowned with the diadem of *waḥī*, truthfulness, infallibility, the nature of his relationship with God and humanity, the nature of his psychic condition during the descent of revelation—all those have been mentioned by Imām Bukhārī and his object in doing so is to make the authoritativeness of the *waḥī* absolute so that not the least scope should be left in its veridicality.

The Meaning of Kayfa.

Kayfa is in the nature of a query. Sometimes its object is to trace the history of something. Arabic usage shows that it is not always meant as a query but sometime also as an expression for denoting exaltation and greatness. This word has been frequently used in the Qur'ān in this sense:

Hast thou not seen how thy Lord dealt with the owners of the Elephant ? (Qur'ān. 105:1)	اَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ فَعَلَ رَبُّكَ بِاَصْحٰبِ الْفِيْلِ (الفیل آیت ۱)
Then see the nature of the consequence for the rejecters. (Qur'ān, 43:25)	فَانْظُرْ كَيْفَ كَانَ عَاقِبَةُ الْمُكَذِّبِيْنَ (زخرف آیت ۲۵)
How Allāh hath created seven heavens in harmony. (Qur'ān, 71:15)	كَيْفَ خَلَقَ اللّٰهُ سَبْعَ سَمٰوٰتٍ طِبَاقًا (نوح آیت ۱۵)

Thus occasions abound where a query is not meant but only signifies exaltation. Similarly, the question very often apparently says something or the other but, what is intended is not merely that indicated by the words but something over and above that also which only the hearer can understand, as is the case in the question by God to Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) "و ما تلک بیمینک یموسیٰ" "And what is that in thy right hand, O Moses?" (Qur'ān, 20:17)

The nature of the question needed only a brief reply: "هی عصای" "This is my staff." The elaboration given by Prophet Moses (Mūsā) (عليه السلام) has been interpreted by many rhetoricians as stretching the discourse for the sake of the relish it provided him. But, in truth, this is not the matter. As the late Shaykh al-Hind, Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan (رحمة الله عليه), has said, although the question was only what has been reproduced, the real purport of the question was: "O Mūsā, see carefully what you hold, so that, if something supernatural befalls it, you might not fall into a dilemma as to whether it was the same staff or you had brought something else by mistake." Prophet Moses (Mūsā) (عليه السلام) understood the tenor of the question and replied accordingly, "O God, it is that very staff which I use every day for clipping leaves and for other purposes. I have not the least doubt in my mind that this is that very staff." This reply is in complete consonance with the purpose of the question, since the prophet had full conviction and certainty that it was a staff. To take another instance, supposing someone asks how the Dār al-'Ulūm at Deoband, which is renowned the world over, began? Would it suffice if one said only this much in reply that its bricks were laid on the ground for its construction? Not at all; for who does not know that the object of the inquirer was not to ask about the mere raising of the edifice with bricks but to know how such a magnificent thing reached this stage. Evidently, an adequate reply to this would require a brief history of the institution. The best example of this occurs in the *Prolegomena* by Qasṭalānī in which he has related the life events of Imām Bukhārī because the latter's pupil, Abū Ja'far Warrāq, asked him a question exactly in this manner: "کیف کان بدء امرک" "How did your affair commence?"

Here, evidently only this much reply would have sufficed that he, at first, went to a school to learn. But the Imām did not limit himself to this reply. Instead, he replied by narrating briefly all the salient events of his life from the time he began his education upto that moment and the way he had acquired all his learning. *Prolegomena* by Qasṭalānī contains a detailed account of all this. The question arises, why did the Imām go to such a length? This is because he knew that in asking such questions the inquirer does not expect a perfunctory statement about his early career; the real object is: "How did you reach this high position and scale the heights of excellence?" In order to bring home the matter to the inquirer, the Imām had to give him a brief account of his life. So, just as such a question has two aspects—the question itself and the object of that question—similarly Bukhārī's *modus operandi* consists of two complementary elements: the Heading and the purport of the Heading, or, as we have said earlier, one is the proposition itself and the other its relevant demonstrative exposition. This part of the *ḥadīth* reported by Ḥaḍrat 'Āiyshah (رضی الله عنها): "How did *waḥī* commence to descend upon the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has no apposition with the Heading from the point of view of its purpose; but those parts of this *ḥadīth* have much more relation with the Heading which pertain to the attributes, high moral, and excellences of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Thus the relevancy of the *ḥadīth* relating to Heracleus, which apparently seemed haphazard, also becomes clear, because it mentions the excellences of the recepient of the *waḥī* through the mouth of an enemy, proving thereby the truthfulness of both the revelation and its recepient.

Similarity of Headings.

In the chapter on the *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān* (Virtues of the Qur'ān) Imām Bukhārī has set this heading: "باب كيف نزول الوحی و اول ما نزل" "How revelation came and how it first descended." That heading appears to resemble this one, since the word *kayfa* (how) is common to both. Whereas in the chapter on *waḥī*, we have *bada'a al-waḥī* "بدء الوحی", there we have *nuzūl al-waḥī* "نزول الوحی" both of which are practically the same. Moreover, in the other book, the word *awwal* follows *waḥī*, which resembles *bada'a*. That is why some have considered it a repetition of the earlier heading, but, in fact, this is not so because, in the first place, the words are different. Even if this were not so, and the words were analogous, there would still not have been any repetition, since the object of the heading is the indication of its causes, stimuli, means, origins and conditions, both as regards time and space, in order to establish the exalted status, infallibility, and absolute truth of revelation, as discussed before. In the *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān* the object was to show as to what used to be the psychic state of the recepient of revelation when it descended, and which *āyah* was the first to descend. But here the time and place and all the excellences of the recepient are spotlighted. Bukhārī is talking of revelation generally, whether it is recited or non-recited, that is whether it is the Qur'ān or the *Ḥadīth*, as Shāh Walī Allāh has pointedly mentioned. In the *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān*, revelation only signifies the Qur'ān because this alone is the subject under consideration. It is the practice of Bukhārī that he sometimes sets two headings with practically the same wordings but there is no duplication with regard to the object of the heading. It carries different meanings at both the places. In the Section entitled *Bāb al-'Ilm* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, he has formed a chapter with the title ***Bāb Faḍl al-'Ilm***, and has established another chapter also with the same words two pages ahead. The second chapter is also entitled ***Bāb Faḍl al-'Ilm***, but there is a difference also in purport here. In the former the object is to etch out the superiority of knowledge and in the latter the same word, *faḍl*, has been employed not in the sense of superiority but surplus or residue—that is, what is left over should be given to others. This is why Bukhārī has reproduced that *ḥadīth* in it according to which the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) narrated an event he saw in a dream, that is, he got a cup of milk from which he drank to his fill, giving what remained to Ḥaḍrat 'Umar (رضی الله عنه). The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) himself interpreted it subsequently saying that the milk imported knowledge. So it comes to light that both the headings are altogether different[1].

Imam Bukhari's Remarkable Ingenuity in Selecting the Ayat

Keeping this very object in view, Bukhārī has selected an *ayāh* as the heading which fully expounds the nature of *waḥī* :

Lo ! We inspire thee as إِنَّآ أَوْحَيْنَآ إِلَيْكَ كَمَآ أَوْحَيْنَآ إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ وَّالنَّبِيِّـۧنَ مِنۢ بَعْدِهِۦ We inspired Noah and the prophets after him. (Qur'ān, 4:163)

---

[1] For a detailed discourse on the words : "و قول الله عز و جل" see the Urdu edition of *Faḍl al-Bārī*, Vol. 1, p. 127.

This *āyah* is very laconic. If we read it attentively further upto "صراطاً مستقيماً" we cannot help being impressed by the penetrating insight, profound knowledge, remarkable understanding and thorough research of Bukhārī. In fact, the very selection of this *āyah* for treatment of *waḥī* and its related matters furnishes the greatest testimony of the magnitude of his scholarship. Let us have a cursory look at this *āyah* along with other *āyāt*.

Lo! We inspire thee as We inspired Noah and the prophets after him.
(Qur'ān, 4:163)

إِنَّآ أَوْحَيْنَآ إِلَيْكَ كَمَآ أَوْحَيْنَآ إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ
وَالنَّبِيِّينَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ (النساء، آيت ١٦٣)

Its purport is that *waḥī* is the command of God and His message which He sends to His Prophets. Fetching analogy with Nūḥ (عليه السلام) and the succeeding prophets, it was indicated that the *waḥī* sent to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is as true as the one sent to the preceding prophets and must be acknowledged as equally true. After mentioning briefly Nūḥ (عليه السلام) and other prophets who came after him, the more spirited, renowned and glorious of them have been particularly mentioned. It has also been clearly indicated that the *Dīn* of all the prophets was in principle the same: the Unity of God, Apostleship, Dispensation of Rewards, and Punishments are basic to all of them. If there were differences in formal matters, they were not real. Hence none of the previous *ummahs* should disagree with them. Similarly, revelation comes to a prophet in different ways. Sometimes an angel brings it forth, at others it appears in the form of a written book, and on certain occasions God Himself addresses His apostle directly. Whatever the mode of transmission, since the behest is that of God and none else, it is equally obligatory upon all human beings to obey it. Whatever the way in which revelation reaches them, there should be no difference in according obedience to it. It is sheer folly to say that we shall consider a prophet true only if he brings a revelation in such and such a manner.

No One can Describe the Complete Nature of *Waḥī*

The true nature and essence of *waḥī* is known only to its recepient. It is beyond the power of anyone but the prophets to unfold its reality and nature fully. Its elucidation by saints and mystics is like the description of a magnificent palace of a king by one of his servants. He can only describe it to the extent he has had the opportunity to see it during the performance of his routine work. It is beyond his capacity to delineate its full condition and magnificence. Its complete description can be given only by the king himself or someone living in it. Nevertheless, we would venture to describe below the nature of *waḥī* according to our limited understanding[1].

The Meaning of *Waḥī*.

The well-known meaning of *waḥī* in Arabic is "الاعلام الخفى" *al-i'lām al-khafī*, that is, covert intimation. But Ibn al-Qayyim has put a rider on it, calling it "الاعلام الخفى السريع" *al-i'lām al-khafī al-sarī'* (that is instantaneous covert intimation. Rāghib in the *Mufradāt* designates it as "الوحى الاشاره السريعة فى خفية" *al-waḥī al-ishārah al-sarī'ah fī khafīyah*, that is a flashing covert monition. This shows that *waḥī* should, lexicographically speaking, possess three characteristics: firstly condensed communication of a vast matter in a flash. This has been likened to an allusion by Imām

---

[1] For discussion on the sublime and immaculate nature of *waḥī* and its obligatory nature for all men, see the original work in Urdu, Vol. I, p. 128.

Rāghib. Both tend to condense a vast matter in a very short compass. Sometimes we come across allusions which denote some book, or author. Sometimes only a slight movement of the lips would denote a particular intent, as when a nobleman, who wishes to help a poor person, would just hum and not say: "Give him something", so that an intelligent person immediately catches the hint. Sometimes even a sign with the fingers suffices. Thus *waḥī* is a slight hint that evokes a multitude of details. The minds of the prophets are so sensitive that they forthwith catch the inmost implication. It is related of the king Sher Shāh Sūrī, that he drew a line on the ground. The people around him thought that he was indulging in some childish prank. But his vizier caught the hint and said: "Yes, your majesty! this would be done", and had a broad highway constructed. The prophets, likewise, decipher the nature of the message immediately.

The second characteristic of *waḥī* is its celerity, that is, its descent should be extraordinarily swift. Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn ibn Al-'Arabī says that prophets understand *waḥī* the moment it is received, and communication and comprehension take place simultaneously. The semantics of Arabic are such that there is no equivalent for *waḥī* in any other language. The third feature of *waḥī* is a subtle arcana or mysterious innuendo which no one else except a prophet can catch. Rāghib has the capacity to reach the core of the matter. What superb points has he unfolded here in elucidating *waḥī*. The word, *waḥī*, in its literal sense has a very wide signification, so much so that sometimes it is spoken of in relation to Satan even:

Lo! the devils do inspire their minions to dispute with you. (Qur'ān, 6:122)

وَإِنَّ الشَّيَاطِينَ لَيُوحُونَ إِلَىٰ أَوْلِيَائِهِمْ
لِيُجَادِلُوكُمْ (الانعام، آیت ۱۲۲)

Again, there are several kinds of *waḥī* which come from God in respect of lexicographical connotation. One of these pertains to the non-exalted beings who are not subject to any obligation as God has Himself said:

And thy Lord inspired the bee, saying: Choose thou habitations in the hills and in the trees and in that which they thatch. (Qur'ān, 16:68)

وَأَوْحَىٰ رَبُّكَ إِلَى النَّحْلِ أَنِ اتَّخِذِي مِنَ
الْجِبَالِ بُيُوتًا وَمِنَ الشَّجَرِ وَمِمَّا يَعْرِشُونَ (النحل، آیت ۶۸)

The second kind is associated with the exalted but non-prophetic beings:

When We inspired in thy mother that which is inspired. (Qur'ān, 20:38)

إِذْ أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَىٰ أُمِّكَ مَا يُوحَىٰ (طٰہٰ، آیت ۳۸)

And when I inspired the disciples, (saying): Believe in Me. (Qur'ān, 5:111)

وَإِذْ أَوْحَيْتُ إِلَى الْحَوَارِيِّينَ أَنْ آمِنُوا بِي (مائدہ، آیت ۱۱۱)

The third kind of *waḥī* is associated specifically with the prophets, the three forms of which have been described in the following *āyah*:

It was not (vouchsafed) to any mortal that Allāh should speak to him unless (it be) by revelation or from behind a veil, or (that) He sendeth a messenger to reveal what He will by His leave. (Qur'ān, 42:51)

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُكَلِّمَهُ اللَّهُ إِلَّا وَحْيًا
أَوْ مِنْ وَرَاءِ حِجَابٍ أَوْ يُرْسِلَ رَسُولًا فَيُوحِيَ
بِإِذْنِهِ مَا يَشَاءُ (شوریٰ، آیت ۵۱)

No human being with his elemental make-up and present mental capacities is endowed with the capacity that God should speak to him face to face and he should be able to stand it. Hence there are only three ways in which God can address any person :

(i) God should speak to him directly, hidden behind a curtain, that is the prophet is affected by hearing God's voice but is not graced with His epiphany. This is what happened to Prophet Mūsā (علیه السلام) at *Mt. Sīnāī* and the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) on the *Laylatul Isrā'* (the Night of Journey);

(ii) Discourse through the agency of an angel who does not appear in concrete form before the prophet's eye but straightaway descends upon his mind without the sensuous organs coming into the picture ;

(iii) The angel appears before the prophet in an ocular manner and conveys the message of God just as one person speaks to another. (This would be discussed in detail in the *ḥadīth* narrated by Ḥaḍrat 'Āiyshah (رضی الله عنها).

The nature of *waḥī* to all other beings is of different types; that to a honeybee and ordinary human beings differs from that to a non-prophet and that to a prophet is of an altogether different type.

Ibn al-Qayyim on *Waḥī*.

Ibn al-Qayyim has claimed that, when God Himself converses with a prophet, whether it be in his mind so that he hears it with the ear of his heart, in accordance with "الا وحیاً" "except as infused", or it is directly from behind a curtain, so that the prophet hears it physically, corresponding to "او من ورا' حجاب", both these kinds of divine address are exclusive to prophets. However great a non-prophet, he just cannot aspire to attain this status.

Ibn al-Qayyim further says in his discourse on *waḥī* that some divines are reported to have claimed hearing non-human supranatural voices. We do not belie them; they must certainly have heard them, but it must have been in one of the three forms, a fourth one being out of the question. The first is that the angels speak on their own behalf (not on God's) and one hears what they say. The second is that the discourse is by jinns, whether virtuous or otherwise. The third possibility—the most frequent—which often proves deceptive to the recepient—is that when their fine perceptive faculty becomes thoroughly purified and purged of all gross associations, their intellectual faculty does not remain inoperative, but having withdrawn from external proclivities, continues operating inwardly. Thus when the mind throws off certain things heard or seen, the intellectual faculty grasps some of them, which makes the subject harbour the thought that he is hearing or seeing something ; he actually neither hears nor sees anything from outside. The source of all this lies within himself.

This is just like those dreams which are called اضغاث احلام *aḍghāth-u-aḥlām* (scattered ideas). When the contemplative faculty is detached from external associations, it keeps ruminating inwardly, and whatever was already preserved in the memory, is toyed with by imagination tacking on one thing to another and effecting a permutation of images ushered before the mind's eye. Alternatively, rank humours also hatch different kinds of dreams. A phlegmatic person would, for example, have dreams of river and water. There is no intrusion in such dreams by any foreign or external element. The source of all lies inside the mind. Only when sleep overtakes us, the cognitive faculty is unchained and gets the opportunity for internal juggling, so that the train of the unconscious carries thoughts and ideas to the pitch we have discussed just now. This state does not arise when someone is awake, except in those whose psyche is freed from the environmental bonds even in the waking state. In their case the same condition as that of sleep crops up even when they are awake. In any case, it is only the prophets who can hear God.

Ilhām **(Inspiration)**

Of the kinds of *waḥī* common to both prophets and non-prophets, one is *ilhām*. That is why the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) used to pray "اللهم الهمنى رشدى" "May God inspire me towards righteousness!" Non-prophetic beings also receive *ilhām*; "فالهمها فجورها و تقوٰها" "And inspired it (with conscience of) what is wrong for it and (what is) right for it." (Qur'ān, 91:8)

The only distinction between the two is that the inspiration of a prophet is untainted and immaculate whereas that of a mystic is not uncontaminated because it is likely to be Satanic. There is difference of opinion as to whether an angel figures in the *ilhām* of the mystics or not. Ghazālī says that an angel does not figure while Shaykh Ibn al-'Arabī has confuted this opinion of his in the *Futūḥāt*, attributing it to a lack of experience on his part, because he could not reach that high pitch where such an experience could be felt; he himself had reached this stage and knew from experience that an angel is involved. Experience, however, shows, according to him, that, when the angel brings an *ilhām*, he is invisible. The mystic thinks that the angel is speaking to him (*Ilqā*) but he is invisible, all the same.

Ibn al-'Arabī maintains that he and many others had the experience of an angel bringing *ilhām* but that was not *Rūḥ al-qudus* (Angel Jibra'īl) but some other angel or angels. Visitation by Jibra'īl is reserved for the prophets only. Similarly, a mystic cannot see an angel; this is also the privilege of the prophets. For this reason, the inspirational experience of a mystic is not absolute or error-proof inasmuch as he cannot see the angel nor can he ascertain as to who is addressing him, whether Satan or a Jinn. Since the *ilhām* of a prophet is free from this possibility it is absolutely certain. The prophets immediately identify the angel through their innate sense and cognitive faculty. It is possible, moreover, for a mystic to see an angel, as in the case of 'Imrān bin Ḥuṣayn, but it is impossible in the case of mystics for the visibility and voice of an angel to coalesce. In any case Divine speech does not figure in the *ilhām* of the mystics, as Ibn Qayyim maintains, nor is the angel involved as Imām Ghazālī holds. Even if the angel figures, he cannot be both seen and heard, as Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī maintains. But all this does come about in a prophet's *ilhām*.

The *Ṣiddīqs* and *Muḥaddaths*.

There are two major and perfect kinds of the recepients of *ilhām* of the former kind, the *ṣiddīqs* and the *muḥaddaths*. The *Aḥādīth* mention both. One *ḥadīth* says: "The earlier *ummahs* had *muḥaddaths*, and, if there is a *muḥaddath* now, it is 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb." *Muḥaddath* means "One who is conversed with." The *ṣiddīq* is higher than the *muḥaddath* as his ways and attributes reflect those of the Prophet[1]. This type is exemplified by Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr (رضی الله عنه).

---

[1] This point has been discussed in detail in the Urdu version (pp. 131-33) where the view of Mujaddid Alf-i-Thānī is also given.

It has been stated in the *āyah* already quoted "Lo! We inspire thee as We inspired Noah and the prophets after him" (Qur'ān, 4:163) that for the guidance of mankind the Almighty God sent *waḥī* to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) as He sent it to Prophet Nūh (عليه السلام) and the succeeding prophets. If the descent of *waḥī* spans the period from Prophet Ādam (عليه السلام) to Prophet Nūh (عليه السلام), then why has the *waḥī* been particularised with respect to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and likened to that which descended upon Prophet Nūḥ (عليه السلام) and the succeeding prophets? Let us digress a little before attempting to understand this specific point.

Reason for Fetching Similitude Between the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and Preceding Prophets

A man's life comprises two stages, the first reaching up to puberty and the second beyond that. During the formative period the infant is made to accustom himself to simple things by his parents and guardians, and most of the training relates to sustaining his body so that he should be able to stand the burden of responsibility. Although the child is taught at home the Qur'ān, principles of Islamic theology and prayer, besides other Islamic injunctions, yet they do not constitute the real object; these are simply a means of disciplining him. That is why a child is not punished for dereliction. What is more important is that he is imparted education in elementary matters necessary for social life. But when he gains in understanding, he is sent to an educational institution and his upbringing takes place on different lines; if needs be, he is reprimanded and subjected even to corporeal punishment if he is indifferent to his schooling. Sometimes a long period is required to subject him to discipline and bring him round to the right course.

Man a Microcosm.

When man, who is a microcosm, has his course of life in such wise, then the world which is the macrocosm and a Major Person, has a similar course too, and the attitude of its Guardian, the Divine Being, is *mutatus mutandis* the same. From Prophet Ādam (عليه السلام) to Prophet Nūḥ (عليه السلام) was the period of its nonage and schooling. Hence most of the attention was paid to vocational matters for purposes of earning livelihood; man was not imposed any dictates of the *Sharī'ah*. Only some essential perfunctory orders were casually issued, the *waḥī* being mostly concerned with incipient matters. More attention was bestowed upon the mode of cultivation, house-building, necessities of life, etc. Then when the period of upbringing was over and humanity gradually reached the stage of maturity, becoming well acquainted with the nature of human affairs and requirements, and learning all it could, Prophet Nūḥ (عليه السلام) was sent with a long, long life for reforming the world in which obligation lay the main thing to be considered. So it has been reported from Ibn 'Abbās that ten centuries after Prophet Ādam (عليه السلام), Prophet Nūḥ (عليه السلام) was deputed who strove hard to remove polytheism, heterodoxy and barbarianism, bearing untold hardships and excruciating sufferings for a long time, till at last he prayed: "انى مغلوب فانتصر" "I am vanquished, so give help." (Qur'ān, 54:10). The mind of men had become so perverted that all efforts to reform them proved abortive and the endeavours of Nūḥ (عليه السلام), spreading over a long span of some nine hundred and fifty odd years, could not put a stop to their pernicious activities, so that man's guilt was proved to the hilt, justifying divine chastisement. Prophet Nūḥ (عليه السلام)

was accordingly informed through *waḥī* that all those who were to embrace faith had done so and none else would do so thereafter.

لَنْ يُّؤْمِنَ مِنْ قَوْمِكَ اِلَّا مَنْ قَدْ اٰمَنَ (ہود، آیت ٣٦)

No one of thy folk will believe save him who hath believed already.
(Qur'ān, 11:36)

Then Nūḥ (عليه السلام) in utter desperation prayed to God the Almighty whose wrath descended with full intensity. This was the first occasion on which a *Sharī'ah* sent through *waḥī* was set at naught, as a result of which a terrible flood raged and drowned Nūḥ's people who had not paid any heed to what their prophet had said and turned a deaf ear to the Word of Truth even after hearing it. Nūḥ's imprecation has been reported thus in the Qur'ān:

رَبِّ لَا تَذَرْ عَلَى الْاَرْضِ مِنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ دَيَّارًا (نوح آیت ٢٦)

My Lord ! Leave not one of the disbelievers in the Land. (Qur'ān, 71:26)

So a calamity befell from Heaven and all the infidels were killed[1]. Nūḥ (عليه السلام) was the first prophet to receive juridical *waḥī* and to confront the infidels. The fact of Nūḥ (عليه السلام) being the first messenger from God is supported by this report that when the dead will rise from their graves on the Doomsday and seek one who would intercede on their behalf, they would go to Nūḥ (عليه السلام) and say: "God the Almighty made you the first messenger." In Bukhārī's own *Kitāb al-Tafsīr* this report has been put down thus:

اَنْتَ اَوَّلُ الرُّسُلِ اِلٰى اَهْلِ الْاَرْضِ وَسَمَّاكَ اللّٰهُ عَبْدًا شَكُوْرًا

You are the first juridical prophet for people of the world and God has designated you as *'Abdan Shakūran* (i.e., a grateful slave).

This then is the *raison d'etre* for Nūḥ (عليه السلام) being the first prophet with a *Sharī'ah*; his are the people all sections of whom unanimously adopted polytheism and heterodoxy, so that paganism was organised as a cult. This had never happened before. It is possible that once in a while, someone may have turned apostate, otherwise people at large believed in one God before his time. Nūḥ's were the people on whom God the Almighty's Wrath descended first of all. Thus when the Deluge came, all, except those who were in Nūḥ's Arc, were destroyed, and a new world came into being from Nūḥ's progeny. That is why he is called Ādam the Second. This is the *raison d'etre* for particularising Nūḥ (عليه السلام) in this context.

Reasons for the Similitude

At any rate, prophets continued to come one after another from Nūḥ (عليه السلام) onward with different *sharī'ahs* and religions and kept prescribing remedies according to the capacity of their people. When man reached the zenith of all types of capacities and capabilities, God Almighty sent the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) last of all with the most perfect and consummate Faith. Since the revelation that descended upon him was *tashri'ī*, that is juridical in nature, like that of the line of prophets from Nūḥ (عليه السلام) onward, and he too had to face a host of infidels, it was quite appropriate to liken the revelation communicated to him to that of Nūḥ (عليه السلام) and prophets succeeding him. Another reason for this analogy is that this particular type of *waḥī* is not like that of the prophets Ādam and Shīth (عليهما السلام) which was in the nature of infrastructure, that is the laying down of foundations; it is of a juridical nature so that it threatens with sanctions and punishments if the responsibilities are evaded. Further this analogy also imparts warning to the inhabitants of Makkah that the consequences which arose from belying the erstwhile prophets could accrue in their case too. These prophets had invited people to believe in one God, taught them the lesson of dignity and glory but they had replied with insult, mockery and ridicule; not only that, they had hurled stones at them calling them lunatics and mad men. If this very attitude of contumely is repeated now when the Last of the Prophets (صلی الله علیه وسلم) has raised his voice calling to Truth, the whole universe might be turned upside down. Apart from this, another subtle hint was dropped to the People of Scripture (اهل کتاب), the Jews and Christians, that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was not claiming any thing new. Such revelations had descended upon Nūḥ (علیه السلام) and hundreds of prophets after him long before, for instance Mūsā and 'Īsā (علیهما السلام). Accordingly, it has been said in the Qur'ān:

---

[1] For justification of Prophet Nūḥ's imprecation, see p. 135 of the Urdu work, Vol. I.

I am no new thing among the messengers (of Allāh). (Qur'ān, 46:9)

مَا كُنْتُ بِدْعًا مِّنَ الرُّسُلِ (الاحقاف آیت ٩)

There are numerous other such *āyāt* to the same tune in the Qur'ān. Under the caption *bada'a al-waḥī*, Imām Bukhārī has tabulated six Traditions. We now take up their elucidation one by one.

1. We are told by Ḥumaydī on the authority of Sufyān on the authority of Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd Anṣārī who reported it on the authority of Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm Taymī on the authority of 'Alqamah bin Waqqāṣ Laythī, the last-named heard it from:

★ Ḥaḍrat 'Umar bin Khaṭṭāb (*radiallāho 'anho*) who said it on the pulpit: I heard the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say, "All (meritorious) deeds become so by intention; if a person migrates for worldly gains or to marry a woman, his migration will be for these very purposes only."

١۔ حَدَّثَنَا الْحُمَيْدِيُّ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا سُفْيَانُ
قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى ابْنُ سَعِيْدِنِ الْأَنْصَارِيُّ قَالَ
أَخْبَرَنِي مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ التَّيْمِيُّ أَنَّهُ سَمِعَ
عَلْقَمَةَ بْنَ وَقَّاصِنِ اللَّيْثِيَّ يَقُوْلُ سَمِعْتُ عُمَرَ
بْنَ الْخَطَّابِ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ عَلَى الْمِنْبَرِ يَقُوْلُ سَمِعْتُ
رَسُوْلَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُوْلُ إِنَّمَا
الْأَعْمَالُ بِالنِّيَّاتِ وَإِنَّمَا لِامْرِئٍ مَا نَوٰى
فَمَنْ كَانَتْ هِجْرَتُهُ إِلَى دُنْيَا يُصِيْبُهَا أَوْ إِلَى
امْرَأَةٍ يَنْكِحُهَا فَهِجْرَتُهُ إِلَى مَا هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِ ؕ

Authority for the above *Ḥadīth*.

The narrator mentioned in the above *ḥadīth*, Humaydī, was the Shaykh of Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله علیه) who was also a colleague of Imām Shāfi'ī (رحمة الله علیه) from whom he derived considerable benefit in academic matters, and not the compiler of the *Al-Jama' Bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* who lived long after the Imām. By Sufyān is meant the great *muḥaddith*, Sufyān bin 'Uyaynah since there is no reporting from Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd by Thaurī. Sufyān bin 'Uyaynah was a pupil of Imām Ḥanbal. Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd Anṣārī was a great *tābi'ī* Traditionist and jurist. Such top-notch personages as Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Imām Mālik and Imām Awzā'ī (رحمهم الله) have reported on his authority. Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm was a renowned *tābi'ī muḥaddith* from whom Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's teachers have reported. Some have claimed the continuous narration of this *ḥadīth* but this is incorrect because the narration is throughout individual from 'Umar (رضی الله عنه) to Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd Anṣārī. This is so because there is no report whatsoever with correct authority from Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm except that of Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd. Similarly the condition for correct authority has been laid down in the case of reporting from 'Alqamah with the exception of Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm and from 'Umar (رضی اللہ عنہ)—with the exception of 'Alqamah—because it is possible there might be a report by someone else also, though its authority be weak. However, there is a large number of persons reporting from Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd. Some have claimed two hundred and others as many as seven hundred, although Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has said that since his time of studentship to the writing of *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, there were only about one hundred according to his research. In any case there are numerous narrators in this particular section but for continuous narration reporting by several persons in every consecutive section (*ṭabaqah*) is necessary. It is strange that Ḥaḍrat 'Umar (رضی اللہ عنہ) narrated this *ḥadīth* on a pulpit which shows that the audience was a large one consisting of a multitude of men.

In spite of this, no one has reported it from him with correct authority except 'Alqamah. Moreover, Bukhārī has cited it at no less than seven places. On the last occasion, in the *Kitāb al-Ḥiyal*, he has reproduced it with the additional preliminary words "یا ایہا الناس" which make the whole text thus: "O people, the results of deeds stem from intentions." From this it appears that perhaps the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) too spoke these words in one of his sermons addressed to a large gathering. The words, "O people" point to this, which fact has been acknowledged by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar also. However, in a manuscript of 'Ābid Musnadī's *Mawāhib-i-Laṭīfah* (Subtle Monitions), which is a commentary on the *Musnad* of Abī Ḥanīfah, I have come across a version of this *ḥadīth* the wording of which is reproduced as follows in the *Muntahī al-Āmāl* of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī from Zubayr bin Bakār's *Akhbār al-Madīnah*:—

> A person married a woman who was an emigre. The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) mounted the pulpit and addressing the people said, "O men, indeed the deeds spring from intentions."
>
> قَدِمَ رَجُلٌ فَتَزَوَّجَ امْرَأَةً كَانَتْ مُهَاجِرَةً
> فَجَلَسَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى الْمِنْبَرِ
> فَقَالَ يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّمَا الْأَعْمَالُ بِالنِّيَّاتِ

This explicitly mentions the fact of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) standing on the pulpit and addressing a public gathering. But it is surprising that Ḥaḍrat 'Umar (رضی اللہ عنہ) is the sole person reporting from the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) and he too related it on the pulpit. Here also we have no reporter with correct authority except 'Alqamah. However, since it is contained in both *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*, there is no doubt about its authenticity. According to the principles of *fiqh*, a *ḥadīth* like this in which the reporter is singular in the primary section (طبقہ) and subsequently the number of narrators increases, whether in the first or second section of *tābi'īn*, is called *mashhūr*. But, according to the principles of *Ḥadīth* it does not belong to this category because there should be at least two reporters in every section. There can, however, be continuity of report, as maintained by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, because the hanging of actions upon intentions has been stressed over and over again in a number of Traditions and *āyāt*. This refutes the opinion of Ḥākim that both the Imāms, Bukhārī and Muslim, do not report anything of lesser category than the '*azīz*, the type of *ḥadīth* which has two reporters in every successive section. The very first report of Bukhārī has, however, been a solo report in four successive sections, for 'Alqamah reported from 'Umar bin Khaṭṭāb, Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm from 'Alqamah and Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd from Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm, whereas 'Umar himself reported from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Abū Ḥanīfah has also reported this *ḥadīth* from Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd, though he has used the word intention in the singular, that is *binnīyyat* (with intention) and not *binnīyyāt* (with intentions).

Concord between the *Ḥadīth* and its Heading.

This point is controversial. One section of scholars holds that there is no need of finding any apposition between the *ḥadīth* and its heading, as Imām Bukhārī has reproduced it for no other reason than his own purity of intention and not only alerted himself but invited the attention of others also to the same. In other words, one should not only inculcate oneself but all those teaching and learning the science of the Tradition that before compiling and assorting, teaching and learning the *Aḥādīth*, they should develop thorough purity of intention.

That is why some writers have reproduced this *ḥadīth* for this very reason before dealing with its purpose as is the case with the author of the *Mishkāt*.

This might give rise to the objection that if this *ḥadīth* has been set down for this very reason without regard to relevancy, Bukhārī would have mentioned this in the heading of the chapter. The very fact that it comes after fixing the heading of the chapter, shows that it must be having some concordance with the chapter. This has been answered by saying that intention is for the sake of proximity to and worship of God, which is related to the *Aḥādīth* that follow. The heading constitutes Bukhārī's own induction; therefore, even though it occurs after the superscription, it, nonetheless, precedes the *ḥadīth*. Some hold that its agreement is with the last part of the heading, wherein the similarity of the *waḥī* that came to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to that of Nūḥ and subsequent prophets has been indicated. As an instance of this similarity, we present the *ḥadīth* itself: "انما الاعمال بالنيات", since this is something common to all the prophets and was taught to all of them. The Qur'ān says:

And they are ordained naught else than to serve Allāh, keeping religion pure for Him. (Qur'ān, 98:5)	وَمَآ اُمِرُوْٓا اِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوا اللّٰهَ مُخْلِصِيْنَ لَهُ الدِّيْنَ (البيّنة، آيت ۵)

To my mind the real object of Imām Bukhārī besides these points is to show that among the emblems of perfection of a prophet is that he should possesss utmost sincerity of purpose. The first thing to be seen is the extent of his sincerity and the degree of his *bona fide*. Imām Bukhārī has invited our attention by saying that the nature of intuition of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) can be ascertained from his life. At a time when associationism, idolatry, paganism and ignorance prevailed all around and none was prepared to believe in the Divine Being, a man of God arose and with his high resolve and firm determination changed the whole course of the history of mankind. A government assigns responsibility only to one who, besides possessing knowledge and capacity for action, possesses sincerity and purity of intention also to a high degree. A person exalted to a high status is cognizant of all the secrets. Hence God grants the lofty office of prophethood to one who is graced with the sublime qualities of extreme fidelity and chaste intention to an extraordinary extent. His mind is full of sincerity and rightness of intention. God's knowledge can never prove erratic. This is why the prophets have been adjudged to be infallible and God Himself has said in the Qur'ān:

It is not (possible) for any human being unto whom Allāh had given the Scripture and Wisdom and the Prophethood that he should afterwards have said unto mankind: Be slaves of me instead of Allāh; (Qur'ān, 3:79)

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ اَنْ يُّؤْتِيَهُ اللّٰهُ الْكِتٰبَ
وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنُّبُوَّةَ ثُمَّ يَقُوْلَ لِلنَّاسِ كُوْنُوْا
عِبَادًا لِّيْ مِنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ (آل عمران آیت ۷۹)

Because of this, prophets Mūsā and Yūsuf (علیهما السلام) have been requited: "کذالک نجزی المحسنین" "Thus do We reward the good." (Qur'ān, 37:110) *Iḥsān* means the *ne plus ultra* of sincerity of purpose. It is because of this sincerity of purpose and strong devotion that the prophets are endowed with splendid fortitude, unflinching courage and complete independence from what is not God. It is because of this that Prophet Mūsā (علیه السلام) had the courage to stand up against a haughty, extremely contumacious and refractory monarch like Pharaoh (who was wont to say: "انا ربکم الاعلیٰ" "I am God the Almighty,") and proclaimed the truth. What tremendous courage is shown by the struggle of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) to preach and propagate Islam. It is because of their conscientiousness and utmost sincerely that prophets prove so very steadfast and unflinching in the discharge of their duty. Mountains may move away from their place but prophets do not budge even a jot or tittle from their appointed mission and duty even if tremendous calamities fall upon their head and they have to undergo unlimited tribulations. The prophets never turn back from facing the whole world all alone. Dā'ūd Kabīr Ṭā'ī writes in the '*Uyūn al-Ḥaqā'iq* (Springs of Truth):

Your grade will be high according to the loftiness and courage of your intentions.

عَلٰى قَدْرِ ارْتِقَاءِ هِمَّتِكَ فِيْ نِيَّتِكَ تَكُوْنُ
دَرَجَتُكَ

Giving the reason for using the word عظیم ('*aẓīm*) in the *āyah*: "انک لعلیٰ خلق عظیم" "And Lo! thou art of a tremendous nature," says the great saint Ḥaḍrat Junayd Baghdādī: "لیس له همة سوی الله تعالیٰ" "He does not have courage except from God the Almighty." Here courage means intention. Therefore the fact comes home to us that sincerity of purpose and truthfulness constitute a major ingredient among the antecedents of *waḥī*. So Imām Bukhārī was quite right in bringing this *ḥadīth* under the heading "کیف کان بدأ الوحی" "How did revelation commence?" This is the primary object which the Imām had in view. It is, however, just possible that his secondary object may have been that the readers of the *ḥadīth* should develop the right intention. Although a piece of writing has one primary intent but it may have another secondary suggestion as well. Hence, by the Grace of God, no loopehole remains in the apposition between the heading and the *ḥādīth* under consideration.

The Occasion for the above *Ḥadīth*.

Just as the *āyāt* pertain to a particular occasion, similarly the *Aḥādīth* too pertain to some situation. That is why a particular matter evoked this saying from the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). As regards this, we have already quoted from the *Mawāhib-i Laṭīfah* which has cited from the *Muntahī al-Āmāl* of al-Suyūṭī. The relevant occasion was that a person migrated and married a woman soon after his arrival at Madinah, which shows that one object he had in mind while migrating was contracting a marriage. Upon this the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) stated this *ḥadīth* on the pulpit. The narration thereof, according to Ṭabrānī, adopted the form of the following words :

One of us sent a proposal of marriage to a woman, Ummi Qays, who refused it and imposed the condition of migration. That man migrated and married her. So we designated him as the Muhājir Ummi Qays.	كَانَ فِيْنَا رَجُلٌ خَطَبَ امْرَاَةً يُّقَالُ لَهَا اُمُّ قَيْسٍ فَاَبَتْ اَنْ تَتَزَوَّجَهٗ حَتّٰى يُهَاجِرَ فَهَاجَرَ فَتَزَوَّجَهَا فَكُنَّا نُسَمِّيْهِ مُهَاجِرَ اُمِّ قَيْسٍ (فتح الباری ص)

In the *Mawāhib* the woman's name, Ummi Qays, has not been identified but this much has been explicitly mentioned that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said so on this occasion. Ṭabrānī has not expressly stated that the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said it on this occasion but he has particularised the woman to whom the matter relates. The sum total of all this is that this incident was the cause which gave rise to this *ḥadīth*. The patronym of this woman, Ummi Qays,[1] whose real name was Qīlah, is found in the *ḥadīth*; but that of her husband has not been discovered despite all efforts. He was generally known as the Muhājir Ummi Qays.

We, however, take a better view of the man and credit him with migrating to Madīnah not merely with the intention of marrying Ummi Qays but also because he was a genuine Believer and a Companion. We do not consider matrimony to be his sole motive and feel that just as sometimes an action is prompted by a number of motives, similarly his migration was really for the sake of God but was combined with the intention of marrying that woman also. Since this was the age of exalted Companions who were embodiments of pure faith and it is well known that "حسنات الابرار سیئات المقربین" "The virtues of the good are the vices of those near," what counts as creditable virtues for the pious would be counted as effrontery and misdemeanor for those that were close to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). Higher personages have always the better of things. Hence this poor fellow came to be sniped at by all for a slight fault and the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) felt displeased with him because even such a minor thing was against the high standard expected from the Companions. What has been said about the Companions in connexion with the Battle of Uhud is to the same effect:

Some of you desired the world, and some of you desired the Hereafter. (Qur'ān, 3:152)	مِنْكُمْ مَّنْ يُّرِيْدُ الدُّنْيَا وَمِنْكُمْ مَّنْ يُّرِيْدُ الْاٰخِرَةَ ۚ (آل عمران، آیت ۱۵۲)

What is implied herein is that no one amongst the Companions was so avid for this world that he should be oblivious of the Hereafter.

As regards the *ḥadīth* under reference, it is اِنَّمَا الْاَعْمَالُ بِالنِّيَّاتِ necessary first to ascertain what is that understood thing to which the preposition *ba* relates. Everyone tries to ferret out the understood word in accordance with his school of thought but, properly speaking, one should ignore one's own particular creed and concentrate on the purpose and subject-matter of the statement, that is the matter in issue, and trace out the intended reference. The Shāfiites hold this to be *taṣiḥḥuḥ binnīyyāt*, importing propriety from the juridical viewpoint, that is no action can be proper without the right intention, which includes the act of performing ablution also.[1]

---

[1] In *Mishkāt al-Maṣābiḥ* there is a mention of Ummi Qays, daughter of Minsān (*Bukhārī* and *Muslim*). (*Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ*, English translation with explanatory notes by James Robson, Vol. 1 (pts. 1-IV), Sh. Muḥammad Ashraf, Lahore (reprinted, 1973), p. 100. This woman had brought an unweaned child to the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). This would substantiate 'Allāmah 'Uthmānī's argument—vide *infra*. *Ed.*

The Ḥanafites believe that the stress is on *binnīyyāt* or *thawāb al-a'māl binnīyyāt*, that is the requital of actions depends upon intention. All this comes to this that the *wuḍū* without intention would be intrinsically all right but there would be no requital therefor. A detailed consideration of the grammatical and other subtleties would lead us into very complicated discussions. Suffice it to say that the Shāfiite viewpoint is open to objection on the score of language. There are three kinds of acts: (1) *ma'ṣīyat* (sins); (2) *ṭā'āt* (acts of devotion), and (3) *mubāḥāt* (acts of goodness). Sins cannot be forgiven, even if the intentions behind them may be good, e.g., a man stealing money to have a mosque built. In short, the word, *al-A'māl*, cannot be taken in an entirely general sense so as to furnish an argument for *wuḍū*.

A Well Known Exposition

Ḥāfiẓ 'Imād al-Dīn Kathīr and Shaykh 'Azīz al-Dīn 'Abd al-Salām hold that the *ḥadīth* in fact means "انما الاعمال بالنيات" that is, the yielding or not of fruit, or yielding good or bad fruit of actions depends upon one's intention, and have declared it to be the real intent of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

The subject of the *ḥadīth* is not to take up a juridical issue and to determine whether the *nīyyat* (prior intention) of an act is right or not. The object is just to emphasize the fact that the possibility of an act being good or bad in the eyes of God, or its being a source of bliss or bestowal of beatitude, is dependent upon one's intention. This is also the gist of the explanation given by Shaykh Shams al-Dīn Sarūjī Ḥanafī, the author of *Al-Ghāyah Sharḥ al-Hidāyah*.

Purport of the *Ḥadīth*: Two Instances

We should like to clarify the purport of the *ḥadīth* by quoting two examples. An action may be all right *per se* but bad intention makes it bad, yielding bad fruit. The Qur'ān has indicated its vitiating effects, exemplified by the case of the mosque of *ḍirār*. The building of a mosque is in itself a good action but since the intention was malificent, it yielded the fruit it did, as mentioned in the Qur'ān:

> And as for those who chose a place of worship out of opposition and disbelief and in order to cause dissent among the believers, and as an outpost for those who warred against Allāh and his messenger.
> (Qur'ān, 9:107)

> وَالَّذِيْنَ اتَّخَذُوْا مَسْجِدًا ضِرَارًا وَّ
> كُفْرًا وَّتَفْرِيْقًا بَيْنَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ وَاِرْصَادًا
> لِّمَنْ حَارَبَ اللّٰهَ وَرَسُوْلَهٗ۔ (توبہ، آیت ۱۰۷)

Similarly—and this point has been briefly raised earlier—however harmless or *bona fide* the intention behind a sin might be, it will not be commendable in the eyes of God; it will continue to be deprecable. In religious matters, however, in some cases requiring relaxation and connivance on grounds of expediency by the man in authority, it is possible to overlook such a commission as is exemplified by the incident of Ḥāṭib ibn Abī Balta'ah. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was making preparations for the conquest of Makkah in utmost secrecy, so that the Quraysh might not get wind of it and he might be able to make full preparations in order to avoid much bloodshed in the premises of the *Ḥaram* and effect the conquest of Makkah easily. The maintenance of secrecy is one of the most important strategies of war. Ḥāṭib wrote a letter about the preparations of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and despatched it to Quraysh. The whole of this incident has been mentioned in the relevant *ḥadīth*. The missive was not only sent at a very inopportune moment but also constituted a very iniquitous act providing every justification that the man should be executed. Accordingly Ḥaḍrat 'Umar again and again felt very furious and sought permission to kill the man there and then because he had apparently caused serious harm to Islam. God intimated the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) through *waḥī* before the letter reached the Quraysh. When the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) sent for Ḥāṭib[1] and asked him about it, he made a clean breast of it, saying: "The families of the immigrants left behind in Makkah have their supporters there, whereas my relatives have none to safeguard them. That is why I tried a little to establish some contact with the people there so that they should not persecute my family. I swear by God that I have not turned away from Islam nor do I like polytheism. I was sure that you will gain a victory, do what I may. Now, you may order whatever you like." Ḥaḍrat 'Umar (رضى الله عنه) again flew into rage but the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: "لا تقولوا له الا خيرا" "Speak nothing but good to him." Although he was pardoned still his act remained reprehensible and did not become good. Hence God says in the *Sūrah Mumtaḥinah*:

---

[1] For an elaborate treatment of the subject, please see the Urdu edition, vol. 1, p. 142.

O ye who believe! Choose not My enemy and your enemy for friends.
(Qur'ān, 60:1)

يٰٓاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا لَا تَتَّخِذُوْا عَدُوِّيْ
وَعَدُوَّكُمْ اَوْلِيَآءَ۔ (ممتحنہ آیت ۱)

The reprehensibility of such action has been described further in the same *rukū'*. A sinful act would remain sinful, notwithstanding the fact that hope for its forgiveness may be entertained because Ḥāṭib bin Abī Balta'ah was one of those who fought in the battle of Badr.

Good intent in Bad Act : Misgiving Removed

A doubt might arise here that sometimes goodness of intent nullifies the taint of badness. For instance, lying is intrinsically bad but purity of intention, as in the case of bringing about reconciliation between two persons, quashes the evil, a matter elucidated by jurists. The answer to this is that the fact of falsehood being intrinsically bad is open to question. Some positively hold that lying is not in itself evil. The second reply is that the cases in which the jurists permit falsehood do not owe their permissibility to the fact that lying is not evil but because the advantage accruing from it is so prodigious that in view of its immense benefit this evil is tolerated, and the hope is strongly entertained from God's Clemency that He would graciously condone the evil thereof for the sake of this good, not that the taint of evil would be obliterated altogether. Finally, the kind of lie that has been permitted is not the lie pure and simple, which is intrinsically evil, but is only equivocation, as was the case with the ambiguous statements of Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr (رضى الله عنه) and Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام)[2].

---

[1] The *Ḥadīth* is as follows: 'Alī said: God's Messenger sent al-Zubair, al-Miqdād and me (a version having Abū Murtād instead of al-Miqdād), and said 'Go till you come to the meadow of Khākh for there is a woman there travelling on a camel who has a letter which you must take from her.' We set off racing one another on our harness till we came to the meadow, and when we found the woman there, we said, 'Bring out the letter.' (*Mishkāt*, Vol. 4, tr. James Robson, pp. 1369-70). [2] Prophet Ibrāhīm (*alaihi al-salām*) passes through the domain of a king who used to seize the wives of others for his *harem* but not their sisters. When Prophet Ibrāhīm (*alaihi al-salām*) was questioned, he replied: "She is my sister", meaning sister in faith. *Ed.*

The *ḥadīth*: In the Light of the Qur'an.

We now present a few Qur'ānic verses to cast more light on the principle underlying this *ḥadīth*:

> O ye who believe! Render not vain your almsgiving by reproach and injury, like him who spendeth his wealth only to be seen of men and believeth not in Allāh and the Last Day. His likeness is as the likeness of a rock whereon is dust of earth; a rainstorm smiteth it, leaving it smooth and bare. They have no control of aught of that which they have gained.
> (Qur'ān, 2:264)

> يٰأَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ اٰمَنُوا لَا تُبْطِلُوا صَدَقٰتِكُمْ
> بِالْمَنِّ وَالْأَذٰى كَالَّذِي يُنْفِقُ مَالَهُ رِئَاءَ النَّاسِ
> وَلَا يُؤْمِنُ بِاللّٰهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْاٰخِرِ فَمَثَلُهُ كَمَثَلِ
> صَفْوَانٍ عَلَيْهِ تُرَابٌ فَأَصَابَهُ وَابِلٌ فَتَرَكَهُ
> صَلْدًا لَا يَقْدِرُونَ عَلٰى شَيْءٍ مِمَّا كَسَبُوا۔ (بقرہ، آیت ۲۶۴)

Again, it has been said:

> And the likeness of those who spend their wealth in search of Allāh's pleasure, and for the strengthening of their souls, is as the likeness of a garden on a height. The rainstorm smiteth it and it bringeth forth its fruit twofold. (Qur'ān, 2:265)

> وَمَثَلُ الَّذِينَ يُنْفِقُونَ أَمْوَالَهُمُ ابْتِغَاءَ مَرْضَاتِ
> اللّٰهِ وَتَثْبِيتًا مِنْ أَنْفُسِهِمْ كَمَثَلِ جَنَّةٍ بِرَبْوَةٍ أَصَابَهَا
> وَابِلٌ فَاٰتَتْ أُكُلَهَا ضِعْفَيْنِ (بقرہ آیت ۲۶۵)

Persistence: Verbal and Significatory.

Imām Shāṭibī in his book, *Muwaffaqāt*, says that at times a law or regulation is put down categorically in a complete form but at others, stray bits thereof are strewn here and there, by combining which we reach the whole, a common denominator, which is embodied in a *ḥadīth* as an integral provision. This is exactly the case in the present *ḥadīth*. On thinking over the *āyāt* cited above, we deduce a common inference, namely "انما الاعمال بالنيات" "Indeed the actions depend upon intentions." That is why the *Ḥadīth* has been called the exegesis and exposition of the Qur'ān. The scholars of *fiqh* believe that there are two kinds of persistence: verbal and significatory. The latter means that one and the same part-theme is not reiterated again and again explicitly, but is gathered as a common denominator by combining many *Aḥādīth*. It is said, for example, that the generosity of Ḥātim Ṭāī and the valour of the Fourth Pious Caliph, 'Alī bin Abū Ṭālib, are persistent although there is not a single sentence testifying the generosity of the one and the valour of the other. This means that incidents pinpointing the munificence of Ḥātim and the valour of 'Alī abound by combining which we reach the conclusion that Ḥātim was very generous while 'Alī was extremely courageous. Most of the *āyāt* of the Qur'ān under consideration do not contain the word "intention" but volition, and the object and qualifying clause or word are such as impart the meaning of intention to the whole sentence.

Distinction between Intention and Volition.

There is a difference between *nīyyat* (intention) and *irādah* (volition). *Nīyyat*, *irādah*, *ham* (resolve) and *'azm* (determination) all are almost synonymous, and yet there is some difference in their implications. 'Allāmah Saiyyid Murtaḍā Zubaydī Ḥanafī in his commentary on *Iḥyā al-'Ulūm* has discussed their significance. We can only briefly indicate the difference here between intention and volition, as pointed out by Ibn Kathīr in his commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Mere volition and *qaṣd* (resolve) are not *nīyyat*. But when we want to differentiate between worship and non-worship, worship and routine, or one type of worship and another, this would be called *nīyyat* (intent). A person, for instance, might abstain from his daily pabulum because he has been advised to do so by his physician or because of disposition, that is, he has no appetite, or by way of religious obligation, to obey the command of God. In all these cases he will be exercising this restraint of his own volition, not involuntarily. But this mere volition cannot be called intention. But when this volition is in compliance with the command of God, which differentiates it from the restraint exercised on medical advice or physiological considerations, then it would be called intention. Thus volition and intention are not two separate things; intention is the same as volition but with a particular incidence. Supposing someone resolves to say his afternoon prayers, then this would be called intention for it involves differentiation between the afternoon and evening prayers. Similarly, if one gives alms to a beggar woman, this might be from natural clemency, the desire for acquiring fame, a libidinous motive, or for the sake of God. If this action is motivated by godly purpose, it would be called intention.

Acting out of Desire.

It should be borne in mind that to act for one's own desire and gratifying oneself is to abjure God the Almighty and to act for another deity. God has therefore said: "ارأيت من اتخذ الهه هواه" "Hast thou seen him who chooseth for his good his own lust?" (Qur'ān, 25:43) The burden of the above discussion is that mere willing or contemplating is not intention; it becomes so when accompanied by a distinctive purport.

Imam Ghazali's Interpretation of *Mens*.

Imām Ghazālī has suggested that *nīyyat* or *mens* consists of two kinds: involuntary and volitional. He illustrates it thus: Suppose a man is standing; he is given a push by someone from behind and falls on his face. Can we say that such a person is offering prayers? On the other hand, there is a man who is offering orisons of his own accord. He had determined beforehand that he would offer prayers to please his Creator. This determination or prior *mens* is called *nīyyat*.

The word, *nīyyat*, is generally employed in the text of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*, as also in mystic parlance, to distinguish a deity from the Deity; in jurisprudence, to distinguish worship from non-worship, and worship from the normal or routine.

A Special Interpretation of the *ḥadīth*.

What the readers have read so far was my view also for long. But what I have been able to understand after a great deal of thought is outlined below.

In the dictum "انما الاعمال بالنيات" the *de facto* existence of an act should be considered as understood but not invested with juridical verity. It should be considered as veritable from God's standpoint because as soon as a good or bad deed is resolved, it becomes established before God, and in spite of not being actually existent, the decision as to whether an action is good and worthy of recompense, or *mala fide* and fit for punishment, is reached. Its existence is just like a foetus which we consider to be existent only when it comes out of the mother's womb, although the spirit had been infused in it long before its birth. But since it was not visible, we did not regard it as existent. However, it was not hidden to God who is cognizant of all that is in the wombs. Therefore in God's view it existed from the very time the conception had taken place. This is borne out by numerous instances in the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*. In the early days of Islam when emigration was a necessary obligation for the Muslims, there were certain persons who had not migrated because of being timid and less spirited; or for some reason or excuse had hid themselves in Makkah, concealing their faith. Some of them had been forcibly brought on the occasion of the Battle of Badr. The excuse of some of them was really plausible; for instance women, children, cripples, etc. This evasion of migration called for a stern admonition in the following *āyah* :

> Lo! as for those whom the angels take (in death) while they wrong themselves, (the angels) will ask: In what were ye engaged? They will say: We were oppressed in the land. (The angels) will say: Was not Allāh's earth spacious that ye could have migrated therein? (Qur'ān, 4:97)

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَوَفّٰهُمُ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةُ ظَالِمِيٓ أَنْفُسِهِمْ
قَالُوا فِيمَ كُنْتُمْ قَالُوا كُنَّا مُسْتَضْعَفِينَ فِي الْأَرْضِ قَالُوٓا
أَلَمْ تَكُنْ أَرْضُ اللّٰهِ وَاسِعَةً فَتُهَاجِرُوا فِيهَا (نساء: ۹۷)

Those who were helpless were excepted as per "الا المستضعفين" "Except the oppressed" but, even about them the Qur'ān says in a remissive tone: "فاولئک عسى الله ان يعفو عنهم" "As for such, it may be that Allāh will pardon them." (Qur'ān, 40:99)

When these *āyāt* reached Makkah, a very aged Muslim asked his sons to betake him soon to Madīnah; so he was put on a bed to be taken there. They had reached near Tan'īm when he breathed his last. When the news reached Madīnah, the Companions said: "Would to God he had reached here!" Thereupon the following revelation came:

> And whoso forsaketh his home, a fugitive unto Allāh and His messenger, and death, overtaketh him, his reward is then incumbent on Allāh." (Qur'ān, 4:100)

وَمَنْ يَخْرُجْ مِنْ بَيْتِهِ مُهَاجِرًا إِلَى اللّٰهِ وَرَسُولِهِ
ثُمَّ يُدْرِكْهُ الْمَوْتُ فَقَدْ وَقَعَ أَجْرُهُ عَلَى اللّٰهِ (نساء: ۱۰۰)

This *āyah* establishes his migration. It is obvious that, to say nothing of the completion of his migration, he had scarcely moved out of the precincts of Makkah. Still God the Almighty announces that such a person's reward is incumbent on Allāh. What is this recompense except for the intention of the migrant? No matter whether he had completed his migration or not, this was consummated in the eyes of God and recompense was awarded therefor. The recompense is pre-determined on the *mens* of a person, not on his embarkation on the act itself or its completion.

There is also another *ḥadīth* which has been reported by Abū Dā'ūd in detail. When the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was on his way to give battle at Tabūk, he said: "There are some people in Madīnah who are co-sharers in whatever you do by way of your journey towards the site of the battle, spending money or waging *jihād* (fighting for the cause of Islam)." The Companions, unable to repress their amazement, said: "Are they participating with us in every act despite being in Madīnah?" Thrice, the Companions put this question in amazement to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) repeated the same statement, and, in the end, said; "حبسهم العذر", that is, they had determined to participate (in the battle) but they were hindered by serious difficulties.

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was making people share the felicity at every step. Evidently, this participation in felicity was on the basis of their *mens*, because mere intention too enjoys a factual status to some degree in God's estimation. In a like manner, *Tirmidhī*, *Ibn Mājah* and *Musnād-i-Aḥmad* have transmitted a *ḥadīth* on Abū Kabshah's authority to the following effect:

There is one person whom God has given both wealth and knowledge. Because of his knowledge he spends liberally on suitable occasions in the way of God. Another possesses knowledge but not wealth. Seeing the first men, he says, "I wish I had money so that I could spend as lavishly as the others." There is still another person whom God has provided neither property nor knowledge; on seeing the others spend in the way of God, he says: Had I wealth I would spend it similarly. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: Both of them equally share the recompense and blessing, therefore, with the first man.

This *ḥadīth* clearly shows that the recompense for an act is determined by the very intention of it even if it may not actually have taken material shape.

Similarly, a reputable (حسن) *ḥadīth* has been reproduced on the authority of Anas bin Mālik in the ***Sunan*** of Dāre Quṭnī that, when the scrolls of deeds performed by human beings are presented before God by the angels, He orders some deeds to be set aside, as they had not been performed for God's sake. Then He directs the angels to put down such and such an act but the angels say they had not observed any such act. Then God says: He had the intention of doing it. This shows that many deeds actually performed were scored out while those that had not been performed were recompensed merely on the basis of intention. The angels accordingly write down that act. Although not actually performed, such acts were put on record by God because in His reckoning a deed exists in some measure, simply on the ground of intention.

'Allāmah Ālūsī has reproduced in the *Rūh al-Ma'ānī* from the *Musnad* of Abū Ya'lī and Bayhaqī (*Shu'ab al-Īmān*) a tradition on the authority of Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is reported to have said:

مَنْ خَرَجَ حَاجًّا فَمَاتَ كُتِبَ لَهُ أَجْرُ الْحَاجِّ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيٰمَةِ وَمَنْ خَرَجَ مُعْتَمِرًا فَمَاتَ كُتِبَ لَهُ أَجْرُ الْمُعْتَمِرِ
إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيٰمَةِ وَمَنْ خَرَجَ غَازِيًا فِي سَبِيلِ اللّٰهِ تَعَالَى فَمَاتَ كُتِبَ لَهُ أَجْرُ الْغَازِي إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيٰمَةِ

The person who started with the intention of performing the *ḥajj* but died on the way before performing it, earns as much reward till the Doomsday as the one who has performed it. And anyone who started with the intention of performing the *'umrah* and died on the way before it was consummated, also earns as much reward as the one who has had the felicity of performing it. And anyone who set out with the intention of waging *jihād* and died before he actually did so, his reward is set down as equivalent to that of a person who has participated in a *ghazwah* (Prophet's battle).

It is obvious that here also the reward is on the basis of the potential act springing from intention although juristic provisions will not formally apply to it because of its physical non-existence. Thus, this point is proved by many texts of the Qur'ān and the Traditions. If the *ḥadīth* under consideration is taken in this light, its purport comes out clearly without any hindrance whatsoever. Although in matters of action, the formal performance is requited but the real act is that called by the *mens* of the person who undertakes it, because of which its existence in the eye of God is established, and though not actually performed, judgment regarding punishment and reward is passed.[1]

Intention Stressed

Here a misunderstanding might arise that if this *ḥadīth* "انما الاعمال بالنيات" imports this that *mens*, which is something subjective, gives rise to a virtual act, in some measure, then why this restrictive expression which confines it to something subjective only, because the physical organs also take part in the performance of an act? This mode of expression is known as *ḥaṣr-i-qalb* (hedging). It does not really mean delimitation but is meant to emphasise a particular matter since the addressee is under the impression that an act comes into existence through the physical organs only, although it emanates from intention also.[1] Hence in order to establish this in a forceful and striking manner, the narrowing down of the implication is reversed by saying: Nay, far from what has been presumed, action arises from intention only.

---

[1] Details are to be found in the *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* with reference to the *āyah*, as also the *Fatawā* of Ibn Taymiyah, p. 15, the *Mawahib-i Laṭīfah*, p. 13, *'Umdah al-Qārī*, Vol. I, p. 42, and *Qiṣṣah al-Bukhārī fī al-Bay'*.

As quoted before, the words "Every person would get what he aims at" follow "انما الاعمال بالنیات". What relation does this sentence bear to the previous one? There are different statements concerning this. Those who consider rightness of intention as the referend believe this sentence to be merely setting off or emphasising of the previous one, that is "انما الاعمال بالنیات". Thus both the sentences carry the same import.

Abu al-Hasan Sindhi's Elucidation.

Abū al-Ḥasan Sindhī believes that the first sentence is simply introductory and the second constitutes the core of the *ḥadīth*. According to his exposition its befitting significance is that acts should be construed as those over which man has a hold. This is so for two reasons: (1) It is only such acts which are under discussion and no definition of an act is possible without a controlling power. Actions not under one's control are not discussed in *Sharī'ah*, nor does it take any cognizance of such actions. (2) The word act is applied to that action which is committed intentionally by a rational being as has been established by *muḥaddithīn* by reference to the Qur'ānic text. That is why no one speaks of the acts or deeds of quadrupeds. Hence it is conclusive that no voluntary act can be performed without volition or intention of the person who acts, and *nīyyat* is but the intention or desire.

After these preliminary remarks 'Allāmah Abū al-Ḥasan Sindhī says that the existence and verity of voluntary acts cannot be established without that intent and incentive which draw an agent towards an act. The objection might be raised that this is clearly a rational premise. What has it to do with the Founder of the *Sharī'ah*, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم)? We would say in reply that the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has stated this only by way of prelude to juridical issues and there is nothing surprising in the Founder of a *Sharī'ah* putting forward a rational premise. In fact it would have been strange if he had refrained from doing so. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) presented "انما الاعمال بالنیات" simply as an introductory principle or exordium and elucidated it with "انما لکل امریٔ مانوی", thereby indicating that the goodness or badness of an act, the awarding of the requital or punishment therefor; an act being good at one time and bad at another, and the fact of one act becoming a multiple act because of its varying concomitants and consequences, is subservient to the *mens* behind the act, the measure for judging the act of a person being entirely his intention. For this very reason the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has said:

Beware! there is a piece of flesh in the body. If this is in sound state, all other parts will function well. If it is disturbed, the whole body will be disturbed. Let it be known that this is the heart.

اَلَا فِی الْجَسَدِ مُضْغَةٌ اِذَا صَلَحَتْ صَلَحَ
الْجَسَدُ كُلُّهٗ وَاِذَا فَسَدَتْ فَسَدَ الْجَسَدُ كُلُّهٗ
اَلَا وَهِیَ الْقَلْبُ

---

[1] **This has been discussed in detail by Shaykh 'Abd al-Ḥaq Dehlavī, vide *al-Mawahib-i Latīfah*, p. 9.**

This is analogous to another saying of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم):

Every *ummah* possesses a trustworthy person; that of this *ummah* is Abū 'Ubaydah bin al-Jarrāḥ.

لِكُلِّ أُمَّةٍ أَمِيْنٌ وَّأَمِيْنُ هٰذِهِ الْأُمَّةِ
أَبُوْعُبَيْدَةَ بْنُ الْجَرَّاحِ

Another instance consists of the following *ḥadīth* :[1]

Everything has an adornment and the adornment of the Qur'ān is *Sūrah al-Raḥmān*[2].

لِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ زِيْنَةٌ وَّزِيْنَةُ الْقُرْاٰنِ الرَّحْمٰنِ

At both places the first clause of the sentence has been presented as the governing principle of the analogical principle from which the second clause follows. In the *ḥadīth* on *mens*, the expression, "انما الاعمال بالنيات" postulates the governing principle or the ground for analogical reasoning, while the second sentence, "انما لكل امرئ مانوى" is the main burden of the reasoning. In other words, the first represents a universal truth and the second a specific aspect of that.

'Allāmah Sindhī says explicitly that by *nīyyat* is meant volition and intention which is the contrary of involuntariness. As we have already said, volition and intention are two entirely different things.

Qāḍī Bayḍāwī has explained the lexicographic significance of *nīyyat* and then described its juridical nature. Thereafter he has laid stress on the fact that the word, *nīyyat*, which should be taken in its literal sense, advancing reasons for it. Qāḍī Bayḍāwī says that *nīyyat* means mental inclination towards something that accords with our purpose, whether it be to gain profit or to overcome some harm, presently or subsequently. Speaking about the role of *nīyyat* in juridical matters, Bayḍāwī has said that the *Sharī'ah* has identified it with the turning of attention to an action in order to comply with the behest of God and seeking His good will.

Thereafter he says: "The word, *nīyyat*, mentioned in the *ḥadīth* shall be taken at its face value, so that it may be in greater accord with what follows, where the circumstances of the emigrants have been described."

This description is in fact an elaboration of what has been put in a nutshell in "انما الاعمال بالنيات" 'Allāmah Ṭayyibī has explained the significance of both the parts separately. The first tells us what makes acts worth consideration. The answer is intention. The second indicates what makes intention esteemed and appreciable. This is nothing but *bona fides*. The actual words are: "The first part shows that acts are not rewardable or preventive of punishment unless there is intention behind them. The second shows that *nīyyat* becomes worthy and estimable only when it is marked by sincerity and is free from hypocrisy."

---

[1] This *ḥadīth* is on the authority of Haḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin Mas'ūd. Another *ḥadīth* (transmitted by Dārimī) has: "Everything has a hump, and the hump of the Qur'ān is *Sūrah al-Baqarah*. Everything has a kernel, and the kernel of the Qur'ān is *al-Mufaṣṣal*".

[2] "Jābir said that the Messenger of God came out to his Companions and recited to them *Sūrah al-Raḥmān* from beginning to end, but they remained silent. He then said: I recited it to the Jinns on the night they came to me, and they responded in a better manner than you. So often as I came to the words, 'Then which of the favours of your Lord do you deny?' they replied: 'We deny none of Thy favours, O Lord of ours. To thee be praise!' Tirmidhī who has transmitted this *ḥadīth* believed it to be a *gharīb* one. He says:" The *'ulamā* have said on the basis of a *ḥadīth* that when people hear this *āyah*: 'Then which of the favour of your Lord do your deny?' they should reply with 'We deny none of thy favours, O Lord of ours. All praises are for thee!' "

The words:

"He who has migrated for the sake of مَنْ كَانَتْ هِجْرَتُهٗ اِلٰى دُنْيَا يُصِيْبُهَا اَوْ اِلَى امْرَأَةٍ worldly gain or for marrying a woman shall have this migration credited only according to that purpose" are an extensive exposition and elucidation of *mā nawā* (what he had in mind).

There is no mention in the *ḥadīth* that a person migrating with this intention would be committing a sin because marriage is a lawful act and not sinful. What the *hadīth* implies is just that such migration would not be for God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) so that the full reward for migration would not be granted. It cannot be said that he would not have any reward at all, as we have already stated that we do not believe the Companion concerned migrated only with the intention of marriage. His intention was mixed in respect of which Ghazālī has said that the purport dominating in it shall be given weight. If that part of it which is for the sake of God predominates, it will be considered worthy; if otherwise, it shall be treated according to its nature. If both are equal, then in accordance with "آنا آغنى الشركا ء عن الشرک" "I have nothing to do with partners," the intention will not be considered goodly. But here our preponderating belief in the probity of the Companions persuades us to think that the intention in the present case tended towards God. Hence his emigration was not altogether without reward. But since this slight admixture was against the dignity of a Companion, it was met with admonition in the *ḥadīth*.

Why Woman's mention after the World?

The question has been raised as to why woman has been particularly mentioned after *Dunyā* (world) when she too forms a part of it, as has been mentioned in the Qur'ān itself:

> Beautified for mankind is love of the joys (that come) from women and offspring, and stored-up heaps of gold and silver, and horses branded (with their mark), and cattle and land that is comfort of the life of the world. (Qur'ān, 3:14)

زُيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ حُبُّ الشَّهَوٰتِ مِنَ النِّسَآءِ
وَالْبَنِيْنَ وَالْقَنَاطِيْرِ الْمُقَنْطَرَةِ مِنَ الذَّهَبِ
وَالْفِضَّةِ وَالْخَيْلِ الْمُسَوَّمَةِ وَالْاَنْعَامِ وَالْحَرْثِ
ذٰلِكَ مَتَاعُ الْحَيٰوةِ الدُّنْيَا ج (آل عمران آیت ۱۴)

This clearly shows that woman is very much a part of the world. Three answers can be given to the above question.

1. The occasion which led to the *ḥadīth* under discussion is an incident relating to a woman. Hence woman has been particularly mentioned.
2. Another answer is that given in the *Mawāhib-i Laṭīfah*. When the emigrants came to Madīnah, the *Anṣār* were so cooperative and sympathic that they agreed to part with some of their belongings for them, so far so that a person having two wives told an emigrant to choose one of them whom he would divorce and then he could marry her. This might have led to the possibility that a person hearing about this type of sympathy of the *Anṣār*, would migrate in the hope of getting property, riches and wife. Being destitute and penniless, he would think that by migrating to Madīnah he would get all these things. This is why the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) sounded a warning with specific mention of both property and women.

3. Women can be the cause of great mischief so that even very big persons can also be involved in serious entanglements, there being innumerable instances of this.

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) therefore particularised woman after generalizing about material things of the world.

Why Imam Bukhari has Excluded "For the sake of God and His Prophet"?

Another point is why a part of the *ḥadīth* فَمَنْ كَانَتْ هِجْرَتُهُ إِلَى اللهِ وَرَسُولِهِ *faman kānat hijrat-u-hū ilā Allāh-i wa Rasūl-i-hī* (whosoever has migrated for the sake of God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), has been excluded by Imām Bukhārī? It would not do to say that this portion did not reach him, as he has elsewhere reproduced the *ḥadīth* in full, which includes this part also. To say that Ḥumaydī did not receive that portion, therefore Imām Bukhārī received from him this much portion only and has reproduced the whole text as transmitted by another *muḥaddith* would also be wrong. Ḥumaydī's report contains full text of the *ḥadīth*. Therefore there should be some reason for excluding this part here. *Ḥāfiẓ*, however, has brought out one point. Since one object of adducing this *ḥadīth* here was that rightness of intention should be inculcated, the mention of this particular part was apparently an assertion that this work of his was exclusively for the sake of Allāh and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Such an assertion being improper, he was omitting this part out of humility. But this idea does not strike me at all because when Bukhārī has made such an assertion in connexion with the narration of *Aḥādīth*, then where lies the point in omitting a part of the present *ḥadīth* out of humility ? Should another explanation be needed, I would give one according to my understanding.

Let us first consider one thing by way of premise. Shaykh al-Islam Zakarīyyā Anṣārī has cited a principle in his *Al-Ashbah wa al-Naẓāyr*. Although not a Ḥanafi doctor, his statement has been, nevertheless, reproduced by 'Allāmah Shāmī who has done so because he believes that, since it is not against the Ḥanafi school of thought, it can be accepted. This principle is that good acts comprise three kinds: *ṭā'āt* (acts of obedience), *Qurbāt* (acts of proximity to God), and *'ibādāt* (adoration). In the first, prior intention of obedience or submission is not a precondition nor the knowledge of the Being obeyed. There is some difference of opinion on the latter point. For example, if a man who as yet knows nothing about God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) reflects upon the proof of God's existence and the Unity of God, he is rendering obeisance to Him because this is *per se* a very good thing and there are people appointed by God the Almighty who embark upon this intellectual journey. But, to say nothing of obeisance, such a person does not have knowledge at all of God which he is only trying to gain.

In *qurbāt* knowledge of God is necessary but the wish for proximity is not essential, as with recitation of the Qur'ān, etc. For these only knowledge of God is enough; the intent for proximity with recitation every time is not necessary. If, however, it is there, it would be all the better. But one thing is essential : abstention from bad intention. That is, if the recitation is without any motive, it would be worthy of reward but if it is with a bad intent, say with hypocirsy, etc., then it would not be fit for recompense.

In adoration, however, both knowledge of God and the intention to worship are necessary, as in *ṣalāt*, fasting, etc.

Now what we have to see is the type of intention which the *ḥadīth* inculcates. Evidently it falls under *qurbāt*. Since the recitation of the *Aḥādīth* is like the recitation of the Qur'ān, and for *qurbāt* the intention of proximity is not essential, therefore mere abstention from foul motives is sufficient. That is why Bukhārī has excluded the first part, namely *ilallāh*, and has cautioned us by mentioning only the second one: *ilā al-dunyā*, meaning thereby that if you have not the right motive while reading or teaching of *Ḥadīth*, you can at least abstain from *mala fide* intent, which would be sufficient for earning reward.

Two Problems

One problem arising in this connexion is that of Abū Ṭalḥah bin 'Ubayd Allāh, one of the ten persons who have been given tidings of entry into Paradise. He made a marriage proposal to 'Ummi Salīm. The latter said that she was a Muslim and he a non-believer; therefore marriage was out of the question. Thereupon Ṭalḥah embraced Islam and the marriage ceremony was performed. This too gives rise to the question that if Abū Ṭalḥah turned a Muslim for the sake of marriage, how could his acceptance of Islam be considered ingenuous? The second complexity is that, from the grammatical point of view, the expression "من كانت هجرته الى الله ورسوله فهجرته· الى الله و رسوله" "He who undertakes migration for the sake of Allāh and His Apostle, migrates for the sake of Allāh and His Apostle," is not correct, as the contingent and consequent have been joined together.

The answer to the first query lies in this that Abū Ṭalḥah was on the verge of embracing Islam when this namely making a proposal of marriage to 'Ummi Salīm, mother of Anas. He embraced Islam with genuine conviction, not for the sake of marriage.

As regards the second matter relating to grammer, such statements are common for purposes of emphasis as for instance, if anyone says : "انا ابو النجم و شعرى شعرى" "I am Abū al-Najm and my verses are but mine." That is, the verses of others are nothing in comparison with mine. In the case under consideration also the implication is that whosoever migrates for God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), his migration is exclusively for God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), then why should it be not taken in good part? It is certainly approbious. But if he migrates for some worldly benefit, for instance, marriage or the like, then it would not be considered migration for the sake of God, nor would it be considered genuine migration.

Imām Shāfi'ī and Imām Aḥmad (رحمهما الله) are reported to have said that this *ḥadīth* is one-third of Islam. Bayhaqī has explained this by saying that man's actions either spring from the heart or are committed by the tongue and other organs. Those arising from the heart have precedence over the others. There is a well-known *quartet* in this context:

عُمْدَةُ الدِّيْنِ عِنْدَنَا كَلِمَاتٌ مُسْنَدَاتٌ مِنْ قَوْلِ خَيْرِ الْبَرِيَّة
اُتْرُكِ الْمُشَبِّهَاتِ وَازْهَدْ وَدَعْ مَا لَيْسَ يَعْنِيْكَ وَاعْمَلَنْ بِنِيَّة

The pillars of faith according to the words attributed to the Best of Men, the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) are : Relinquish the equivocal, covet not what belongs to others, give up frivolous things, and act with good intent.

2. 'Abd Allāh bin Yūsuf told us that Imām Mālik narrated on the authority of Hishām bin 'Urwah who heard it from his father, who heard it from:

'Umm al-Mu'minīn Ḥaḍrat Āyishah (*raḍiallāho 'anhā*) :

✶ Ḥārith bin Hishām enquired from the Messenger of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) as to how the *waḥī* used to come to him. He replied : "Sometime I hear the sound of the tintinnabulation of a bell, and this mode causes me the greatest physical suffering. By the time this condition is over, I preserve all that has been conveyed. Sometimes an angel appears and speaks to me in human form and I preserve his words." Ḥaḍrat Āyishah (*raḍiallāho 'anhā*) said that she saw the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alahi wa sallam*) in this state on a very cold day when the *waḥi* descended upon him ; when it was over, he perspired so profusely that it seemed as if he had been phlebotomised.

2 حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ يُوْسُفَ قَالَ اَخْبَرَنَا
مَالِكٌ عَنْ هِشَامِ بْنِ عُرْوَةَ عَنْ اَبِيْهِ عَنْ عَآئِشَةَ
اُمِّ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا اَنَّ الْحَارِثَ بْنَ
هِشَامٍ سَأَلَ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
فَقَالَ يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ ! كَيْفَ يَاْتِيْكَ الْوَحْيُ فَقَالَ
رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ : اَحْيَانًا
يَّاْتِيْنِيْ مِثْلَ صَلْصَلَةِ الْجَرَسِ وَهُوَ اَشَدُّهٗ
عَلَيَّ فَيَفْصِمُ عَنِّيْ وَقَدْ وَعَيْتُ عَنْهُ مَا قَالَ وَ
اَحْيَانًا يَتَمَثَّلُ لِيَ الْمَلَكُ رَجُلًا فَيُكَلِّمُنِيْ فَاَعِيْ
مَا يَقُوْلُ قَالَتْ عَآئِشَةُ رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا وَلَقَدْ
رَاَيْتُهٗ يَنْزِلُ عَلَيْهِ الْوَحْيُ فِي الْيَوْمِ الشَّدِيْدِ الْبَرْدِ
فَيَفْصِمُ عَنْهُ وَاِنَّ جَبِيْنَهٗ لَيَتَفَصَّدُ عَرَقًا ۞

The Mother of the Faithful is a patronnymic : عن عائشة أم المؤمنين appellation derived from: "ازواجه آمهاتهم" "And his wives are the mothers of the Believers." She has been designated so out of respect and reverence because a prophet's wives are prohibited to the *ummah* just like a mother. But this does not mean that there should not be observance of seclusion etc. This applies only to such matters as respect, reverence and interdiction of marriage but not all. As for Ḥārith bin Hishām he was one of the eminent Companions and was the brother of Abū Jahl, the Pharoah of the *Ummah*.

Since *waḥī* is a very curious thing, hence Ḥārith : يَارَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ كَيْفَ يَاْتِيْكَ الْوَحْيُ bin Hishām asked this question out of extreme curiosity. It was not on the basis of any misgiving or disbelief, being just like the question put to God the Almighty by Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام): 'رب ارنی کیف تحیی الموتیٰ' "My Lord! show me how thou givest life to the dead." God forbid, how could a great prophet like Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) entertain any doubt or misgiving about the resuscitation of the dead by God ? He asked this question out of sheer curiosity and such curiosity can only arise after complete conviction. It is just like a man asking how telegraphic communication between Makkah, Madīnah, Paris and London takes place after the continuous receipt of messages and news from these places. The question is not due to any dubiety but out of curiosity after knowing this matter as a fact. This would show that questions regarding the attributes of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) are also legitimate because *waḥī* is also one of special matters relating to him. It is in fact a phenomenon exclusive to the prophets, no one having experience of it except them. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not avoid answering this question or refuse to answer it. On the other hand, he replied "یاتینی مثل صلصله الجرس", that is, it resembles the tintinnabulation of a bell. The word, صلصله *ṣalṣalah*, signifies a continuous voice or sound, from which there is no egress of intermediate words or sounds, or in which a hiatus intervenes. That is to say, it should be a continuous, uninterrupted voice like the continuous ringing of a bell or bells. Since there was no other similar thing to present an analogy, hence, in order to make Hishām understand, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) told him what sort of sound it was. There are different opinions about it. Some say it was the sound of the arrival of the angel Jibra'īl, others say that it was the sound of *raṣad*, that is the sound of the wings of the host of angels escorting Jibra'īl. It is a common observation that when myriads of fowl fly together, they give off the same kind of reverberating, rhythmic sound of continuous nature. Some are of the view that it was an alerting sound signalising the arrival of *waḥī*, just like the ringing of a telephone bell when a call is forthcoming. Others say that it is the sound of the *waḥī* itself.

This is a very controversial matter as to whether the divine oration is vocal or not. Most scholars and scholastics maintain that the divine harangue is devoid of voice. Most *muḥaddithīn*, however, think it is vocal but also specify that God has hearing, sight and hands but not like ours.

The Shaykh al-Hind often used to say that, whereas the scholars and exegesists resort to interpretation of God's Hand, Hearing, Sight, etc. they do not do so in the case of Divine Knowledge and Life, although a similar interpretation is needed in their case also, because our knowledge must fall under some category. Allāh is Himself the Creator of categories, so if His Knowledge does not fall under a denomination, then we shall have to say that "له، علم لا كعلمنا" "His Knowledge is not like ours." Similarly about Life. Our life has a beginning and an end, but Divine Life does not partake of these things. Hence we shall have to say : "له، حيات لا كحياتنا" "His Existence is not like ours." In short, the belief of the *salaf* is that whatever attributes stand unequivocally established by Qur'ānic texts, should be left as formal as they are, but with this redeeming qualification that His Attributes are quite unlike those of others, as set down in the Qur'ān :

Naught is as His likeness; and He is the Hearer, the Seer. (Qur'ān, 42:11) لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ ۚ وَهُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْبَصِيرُ ۝ شورى آيت ١١

Just as God the Almighty is above all creation in His Attributes and we cannot describe their nature at all, nor can our understanding apprehend them, similarly He is above His creatures with regard to sound or voice also. What is His Nature? To discuss this when even the *Aḥādīth* are silent on this point, is simply beyond our capacity.

Ibn Khaldun's Illustration

Ibn Khaldūn has given a very striking illustration of the Attributes of God. He says that a weighing balance used for determining the weight of gold and silver is quite all right for this purpose but if a man wishes to weigh the Himalayas with it, he would be very foolish indeed because it cannot hold even a piece of stone. Similarly our understanding might be of great moment by itself and a good means of judging things. This is why man has been saddled with obligations, his very position as an exalted being depending upon this, but it is impossible for it to apprehend the Attributes of God. Hence the *muḥaddithīn* say that since the word *ṣawt* (sound or voice) occurs in the *Aḥādīth*, and we do not know its nature, we believe in it subject to its being figurative. Bukhārī seems to be inclined to the view that sound is there and has given some arguments therefor in a chapter of his *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*. One of these is the *ḥadīth* reported by 'Abd Allāh bin Anīs to the effect that when all people would gather together on the Doomsday, then.

Their Lord will call them in such a voice as will reach far and near. يُنَادِيهِمْ رَبُّهُمْ بِصَوْتٍ يَسْمَعُهُ مَنْ قَرُبَ وَمَنْ بَعُدَ

This explicitly mentions the Divine Voice. There is still another *ḥadīth* which says that when God transmits any command then the angels hear a sound just like a chain being dragged on clean stone and drop into a prostration, fluttering their wings, becoming all attention and overawed. After respite the angels lower down ask those above "ماذا قال ربكم" "What has the Lord said?" They reply "الحق" "The Truth." The Qur'ān says : "حتى اذا فزع الخ" "When their perturbation is removed, then the said type of question and answer takes place." As the Divine Being is Sublime and Grand, they are overwhelmed by His Loftiness and Grandeur.

Similitude of the *Waḥī*

The similitude of the sound of the *waḥī* occurs in the *Aḥādīth* in three forms. One is that it is like the ringing of a bell. The second is like the sound of a chain drawn upon a stone. The third occurs in a *ḥadīth* reported by 'Umar who says that when *waḥī* descended those near the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) heard a sound like the humming of a bee. We can coordinate these things by saying that the angels heard the sound in the form of a chain dragged upon stone, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in the form of the tinkling of a bell, and those close to him in the form of the humming of a bee. Whatever the case may be, the factor common to all of them is that this sound was continuous and persistent such as the one we hear in a telegraph pole through which a whizzing sound is passing, or like that of the buzzing or booming of approaching aircraft. This points to continuity and persistency as the Divine Voice is composite, not compound. This is the view generally held. As to whose sound it actually is, we cannot say. All the above forms are possible. We are not in a position to determine.

These two kinds of sound, tinkling and dragging of the chain upon stone, are close to each other, which, I think, points to the consistency of the sound. The similitude is such that it bespeaks homogenity and not compoundness. Although intermittent by itself it is beyond compoundness. Had the telegraph wire been in use in those days, it is possible that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would have likened the sound of *waḥī* to it because the sound here too is continuous and consistent. The telegraph wire has a bell attached to it which passes the signal to the recepient. In any case the purport of the similitude is to indicate the composite nature of the sound. But what is the upshot of this all? The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) says that when the *waḥī* came and ended he would retain all that the angels brought. The moment it was preserved in the heart, the intimation, the understanding and memorization all took place simultaneously.

'Allamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri's Viewpoint.

According to 'Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī, the dominant view is that it was none else than God's voice. He said that the Divine Voice appears in the *Aḥādīth* at three places: first, on the Empyrean when God transmits it; second, when the angel bears it, and third, when the angel comes to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Thus the origin of the sound is in the Empyrean while its end-point is the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Ibn Hazm's View.

Ibn Ḥazm has quoted the statement of Abū Manṣūr Māturīdī that Allāh's speech is a primeval integral Attribute. When God addresses a prophet, He creates a sound, and in this created sound which is contingent, the primal Attribute of God—Speech—projects itself.

یاتیک: The word *ya'tī* is in the continuous tense—that is how does *waḥī* keep coming to you? Hence the answer too was given in the same tenor because this was the general way in which the *waḥī* used to come. The Companions used to ask such questions also from the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) that cannot be comprehended by the senses.

Question: The angel Jibra'īl had six hundred wings spread over all the regions of the East and West. How could he come in the form of Daḥyah Kalbī or that of any other human being?[1]

Answer : Some people have said that the angel Jibra'īl stays where he is but his spirit comes down. This gives rise to the question that if Jibra'īl's spirit comes below, does the frame in which he is incorporated live or die? Some have said that when God the Almighty granted this power to the angels that they could change their forms and wax big or small, then why was this question raised about Jibra'īl? These beings made of light can appear in various forms. They are at times in human shape, at times in heaven or encompass the stratosphere. On occasions they appear in the likeness of Daḥyah Kalbī and on others in the form of other human beings. This is not something which might be considered impossible. As the dictum goes "الملائکۃ اجسام لطیفۃ تتشکل آی شکل ارادوا[2]" "It is said that the angels are incorporeal beings who can transform themselves into whatever shapes they desire.[3]"

Relation of this *ḥadīth* to the Heading.

From the apparent aspect of this heading the relation of this *ḥadīth* therewith is that the mode of the descent of *waḥī* has been indicated in it, that is it descends like the tinkling of a bell or through the agency of an angel. The angel comes either in human form or as an angel. Anyway this casts light on the fact that the *waḥī* too must have been revealed in this very manner, so that we come to know the general mode of its descent.

The second pertains to the real aspect of *waḥī* which describes its majesty. From this point of view, the present *ḥadīth* is crystal clear. Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah (رضی اللہ عنہا) says: "و کرب و ترید وجهه".

The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) used to become restless whenever *waḥī* descended and his complexion would get anguished and convulsed. This was not experienced once or twice but so many times. Whenever the *waḥī* arrived, he went through the same experience so that the body of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) appeard to have been contorted. This shows that the *waḥī* is something sublime, not self-manufactured, and the Prophet's whole life passed bearing its hardship. Had it been a hothouse product generated artificially, man would not have been able to stand it so many times in a day. Prophet Ādam (علیہ السلام) received *waḥī* only ten times in his whole life; Nūḥ (علیہ السلام) received it fifty times; Ibrāhīm (علیہ السلام) forty-eight times, and 'Īsā (علیہ السلام) fifty times. As regards the Last of Prophets (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), *waḥī* descended on him twenty-four thousand times and every time he underwent this travail. This shows both his truthfulness and the sublimity of revelation.

---

[1] A person known for his beauty of appearance. [2] *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, p. 23. [3] This contains the refutation of those philosophers and heretics who deny the existence of angels. It also furnishes proof of the fact that the replies of the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) in answer to the queries of the Companions were in the nature of education. 'Aynī has said in his book '*Umdah al-Qārī* (p. 64); "There is one body of men which asks questions and another which preserves and propagates till the Divine religion is completed."

Linking the Laudable with the Abominable

This sound of whatsoever it might be was a very hallowed one because it was associated with the sublime Court of God. It has been likened to the tinkling of a bell in the *Ḥadīth* although this is something derogatory having been disapproved by the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) who said that "No angels accompany a caravan which has bells." But since the *raison detre* for the similitude is manifest, namely, continuity and persistency, hence there is no harm in comparing them. Such similes abound in the *Aḥādīth*. If anyone says that such and such a person is like a lion, does this mean similitude in all respects ? No, for the basis of similitude is a special attribute—bravery. This is what uplifts the basis of the simile. The object of a simile is to highlight the thing that is likened. Hence this very aspect was adopted and it is really worthy of the exalted status of a prophet to adduce such a meaningful simile. There could not be a better one. The *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* contains a *ḥadīth* :

إِنَّ الْإِيْمَانَ لَيَأْرِزُ إِلَى الْمَدِيْنَةِ كَمَا
تَأْرِزُ الْحَيَّةُ فِيْ جُحْرِهَا۔

Islam would revert to Madīnah as the snake does to it hole.

If any one from our midst had used this simile, he would have been immediately declared out of the pale of Islam by those who anathematise. Our leading personages have used similes to make things intelligible. Their object was not to revile but to bring out the fact that all similitudes completely fit in with the low things to which likeness has been indicated. This type of denunciation by declaring one out of the pale of Islam is downright tyranny. Here in this *ḥadīth* a chaste thing like faith has been likened to a snake the killing of which even in the precincts of the sanctuary of Ka'bah has been permitted. The object is obvious: that a snake may rove wherever it likes but it at last comes back to its hole. Similarly Islam would take asylum in its own sanctuary during times of chaos and anarchy. As would be mentioned later on in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, when Ḥassān bin Thābit would satirise the infidels, the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) used to say: "O Ḥassān, my kinship ramifies into all the branches of the Quraysh; see that the effect of your satire does not reach me." So please first ascertain the lineage of the person you satirise from Abū Bakr." Ḥassān replied:

كَمَا تُسَلُّ الشَّعْرَةُ مِنَ الْعَجِيْنِ

O Prophet of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*), I will take you out, as hair is taken out from flour.

Just see what things have been compared here with what. It has been mentioned in the books on *Sīrat* that when the Holy Prophet's she-camel squatted at Ḥudaybīyah, he remarked:

حَبَسَهَا حَابِسُ الْفِيْلِ

He who stopped the People of the Elephant, has also stopped the she-camel.

Here the she-camel has been likened to an elephant although the latter animal had come to Makkah for destruction and playing havoc, and the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) on the other hand, had come as a harbinger of peace and good. The object was only to indicate Divine Will. Hence we should only look at the object of the simile (bell). The object in both the similes (bell and chain) was ampleness, continuity and persistency. Hence their pointed mention.

Here in the case of the tinkling of the bell, no mention has been made of an angel but this has been done in the second case. However, when citing the former *ḥadīth* in his Book of Creation (*Kitāb bada'a al-khalq*) Imām Bukhārī has explicitly mentioned the coming of an angel: "ياتينى الملک مثل صلصلة الجرس". Thus in both cases the angel came; the only difference is that in the second case he came and spoke in the form of a human being and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) heard him physically. The angel generally came in the form of Daḥyah Kalbī, as he was a beauteous person and the angels dislike ugliness. In the former case the angel did not appear in palpable form but lighted on the heart where *waḥī* descended and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) saw and heard the angel with the eye and ear of the heart, as mentioned in the Qur'ān "نزل به الروح الامين على قلبک". "Which the True Spirit hath brought down upon thy heart." (Qur'ān, 26:193-194). This shows that the angel descended on the Prophet's heart with the revelation. In short, in the second case the physical senses did figure while in the first they did not, there being no specification of beholding the angel but Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī has specifically mentioned that his observation is essential.

And this mode of descent of *waḥī* is the most burdensome وهو آشده، على for me. The earlier course of this *waḥī* was heavy and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had to concentrate all his capacities to attend to Heaven. At this time sublimation and spiritualism have the upper hand and the lower nature of man is subdued. All these things are against normal human state and evidently everyone feels great difficulty in acting contrary to his nature. For instance if a person has eaten his fill and he is made to eat more, then he would feel it uncongenial because of its being against his physical make-up. Briefly speaking the matter is like this: there is one person who is speaking—the angel—and another who listens—the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Sometimes the speaker turns listener and sometimes the listener adopts the role of speaker. When the angel appeared in human form, he assumed the semblance of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The first condition used to be very hard entailing severe distress because the state of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had to undergo a change, making the beatific qualities of angels dominate, and may be Jibra'īl too had to experience attrition in changing his natural self.

A Caveat

The difference between inspiration and *waḥī* is this that in the former vision of an angel is impossible, whereas in the latter he is seen. Shaykh Muḥi al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī says that the communication of commands and prohibitions takes place to prophets only, not to mystics. The latter are only unfolded the connotations and significances thereof. The Shaykh believes that anyone who claims communication of commands and prohibition is a liar or lunatic. If he deliberately claims this, he is fit for being condemned to death. We are presenting this statement of Ibn al-'Arabī because Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad Qādiyānī has claimed in his *Arba'īn* that his *waḥī* embraces commands and prohibitions, and at the same time claims devotion to Ibn al-'Arabī, reproducing his statements time and again.

This part refers to that part of the *ḥadīth* where "واحيانا يتمثل لى الملک رجلا" the Holy Prophet ((صلى الله عليه وسلم) has said that the angel spoke to him in human form. Grammatically speaking, this sentence is counted among the difficult parts of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Some have taken رجلا (*rajulan*) as a discriminative and others have held it to be definitive. But both of these assumptions pose problems. If we hold *rajulan* to be discriminative then it is urged that this is always used to obviate obscurity or ambiguity, and here we do not have an ambiguity that needs to be removed by means of *rajulan* : the obscurity resides neither in the simile nor in the angel. Nor would it be correct to say that there is obscurity in the configuration ascribed to the angel. Similarly the opinion that *rajulan* is definitive is open to objection because a definitive is that which intimates in some wise about the thing qualified. Therefore if it is considered a definitive then the combined expression would be *al-malaku rajulan*, which is quite wrong because an angel is not a person. Then the definitive only indicates change, and only those things can be so which themselves undergo change. Hence there is no change in man as man. Further, the definitive indicates the case of a subject or object, but here the word *rajulan* does not indicate that too. Therefore it is neither discriminative nor difinitive. It would be therefore better to convert *rajulan* into the objective case, in which event the construction of the sentence would be as follows : "يتمثل لی الملک صورة رجل" "The angel takes the form of a human being."

This sentence means that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عيه وسلم) "فاعی ما يقول" preserved the words of the Message of God through the agency of the angel. The tense employed in the sentence is the aorist arguing for retention, that is, whatever I am told I go on memorizing. The first mode (in the case of the bell) was described as "فيفصم عنی وقد وعيت" "that is, by the time the *waḥī* was over the Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم)" was able to memorize fully everything proceeding from God. The second mode (relating to the angel) is that of "فاعی ما يقول" an aotic or indefinite tense, with the implication that, when the angel came to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) and addressed him, he kept on memorizing whatever he was told. The first is in the past and the second in the aorist tense. The difference should be quite obvious. In the first mode the angel came and finished the *waḥī* and the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) preserved the words. The sentence as a whole is present indefinite. In the second sentence it has been stated that the angel came in human form, and whatever he said the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) followed as it went on. Therefore the word "فاعی" has been employed. In the other case, the communication being a continuous whole, was preserved in memory by the end. Hence the past tense "وعيت" has been used.

This is the end of the *ḥadīth* on the descent of "وان جبينه ليتفصد عرقاً" *waḥī*, where Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah (رضی الله عنها) is describing the state of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) after the *waḥī* was over. The sweat poured from the forehead of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) as if he had been phlebotomised. There can be two reasons for this profuse perspiration. One is that already described. It is but natural that, when a person is oppressed with hard work, he perspires copiously and the descent of *waḥī* was such a thing that when it came, the camel on which the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عليه وسلم) was riding, would perforce bend and sit on the ground. It just could not keep standing. Once a three-word *āyāh* "غير اولی الضرر" descended upon the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عيله وسلم) when his thigh happened to be resting on the thigh of the scribe of the Qur'ān, Ḥaḍrat Zayd bin Thābit. The latter states that it seemed as if his own thigh was about to break. This is not surpirising when the awesomeness of *waḥī* has been described as follows :

لَوْ اَنْزَلْنَا هٰذَا الْقُرْاٰنَ عَلٰى جَبَلٍ
لَّرَاَيْتَهٗ خَاشِعًا مُّتَصَدِّعًا مِّنْ خَشْيَةِ اللّٰهِ حشر آيت ٢١

> **If We had caused this Qur'ān to descend upon a mountain, thou (O Muḥammad) verily hadst seen it humbled, rent asunder by the fear of Allāh. (Qur'ān, 59:21)**

That sacred person upon whom *waḥī* descended alone knew what used to be his plight at that time.

The second reason has been given by Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn al-'Arabī in the *Futūḥāt al-Makkīyah* and Shāh Walī Allāh in the *Ḥujjat Allāh*, namely, that the angel Jibra'īl is all light; hence the Message he brought—the Qur'ān—is all light also. The heart of a prophet is also full of light the natural effect of which is heat. Thereafter when all these three combined, heat was necessarily generated. It is but natural that when there is excessive heat in the body, the excess of heat is thrown out by nature because of which the vapours inside come out in the form of water through the pores. This too is a natural process that when the heat inside is ejected through perspiration, the pores open and air touches the body, going in through the pores, then cold would be felt. This is why, after the descent of *waḥī*, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) would say: "زملونی" or "دثرونی" "Cover me with a blanket," "Cover me with a sheet." We have explained the matter as far as we could. What was the entire condition during revelation and how the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) bore it is known to Allāh and His Apostle alone.

Bearing of *waḥī* and Divine Light: An Anecdote.

A religious scholar of Delhi once told me that a person put him a query that when a hard thing like the mountain Sināī was shattered to pieces by the manifestation of Divine Light, then how did a human being like Prophet Mūsā (علیہ السلام) remain alive?

The scholar replied that modern science has discovered a wire which when set on buildings, acts as an insulator and protects it against lightning. If not equipped with it, even the strongest building would be utterly destroyed. The reason is obvious that though the first type of building may be weak but it is equipped with a kind of wire or conductor rod which absorbs the electricity coming with the lightning and no harm is caused to the building.

In the other building, however, there is no arrangement of this type. Therefore the lightning destroys it. Similarly, in the present case also the Divine Light was the Light Absolute and Prophet Mūsā (علیہ السلام) had a part of this very Light in him. This is why he was able to withstand the shock of Divine manifestation. Although he did lose consciousness, still he remained alive. On the other hand, though the mountain was strong, but it did not bear that resistant stuff which could stand it and was blown to pieces.

Question:—An *āyāh* of the Qur'ān has mentioned three kinds of *waḥī*, but in this *ḥadīth* the first two have not been pointed out, and only the third, which again comprises two kinds, has been mentioned.

Reply:—It is essential first to understand the said *āyāh* which has been fully discussed earlier. But here the matter under consideration is its meaning only: The *āyah* is as follows:

And it was not (vouchsafed) to any mortal that Allāh should speak to him unless (it be) by revelation or from behind a veil, or (that) He sendeth a messenger to reveal what He will by His leave.
(Qur'ān, 42:51)

وَمَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ اَنْ يُّكَلِّمَهُ اللّٰهُ اِلَّا وَحْيًا
اَوْ مِنْ وَّرَآئِ حِجَابٍ اَوْ يُرْسِلَ رَسُوْلًا فَيُوْحِيَ
بِاِذْنِهٖ مَا يَشَآءُ ط (شورٰی آیت ۵۱)

It is beyond men's capacity to face the Presence of God, that is, that God should appear to man. In this *āyah*—Allāh has mentioned three modes of which can be duly established.

(1) One is "وحياً". The word *waḥī* means covert monition, as already elucidated.

(2) The second is "من ورآء حجاب" which means that one should hear with one's ears but be unable to see the Speaker.

There are only two examples of this known to us, none else. The first is that of Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام). Here the address was in a special form not usual with the prophets. Hence the context of this *āyah* specifies this mode of exceptional address :

Lo! We inspire thee as We inspired Noah and the prophets after him, as We inspired Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes and Jesus and Job and Jonah and Aaron and Solomon and as we imparted unto David the Psalms. And messengers We have mentioned unto thee before and messengers We have not mentioned unto thee; and Allāh spake directly unto Moses. (Qur'ān, 4:163-64)

إِنَّآ أَوْحَيْنَآ إِلَيْكَ كَمَآ أَوْحَيْنَآ إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ وَّ
ٱلنَّبِيِّنَ مِنۢ بَعْدِهِۦ ۚ وَأَوْحَيْنَآ إِلَىٰٓ إِبْرٰهِيمَ وَإِسْمٰعِيلَ
وَإِسْحٰقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَٱلْأَسْبَاطِ وَعِيسَىٰ وَأَيُّوبَ
وَيُونُسَ وَهٰرُونَ وَسُلَيْمٰنَ ۚ وَءَاتَيْنَا دَاوُۥدَ زَبُورًا ۚ
وَرُسُلًا قَدْ قَصَصْنٰهُمْ عَلَيْكَ مِن قَبْلُ وَرُسُلًا لَّمْ
نَقْصُصْهُمْ عَلَيْكَ ۚ وَكَلَّمَ ٱللَّهُ مُوسَىٰ تَكْلِيمًا ۚ

Whereas all other prophets have been mentioned under *awḥaynā*, in the case of Mūsā (عليه السلام) specific mention of speaking to Allāh has been made. This clearly shows that the nature of talk with Mūsā was not like that of the *waḥī* to others, otherwise here too "As we sent *waḥī*" would have been said. Moreover, the expression, *kallama Allāh* (Allāh spoke), clearly proves that talk with him took place in a special way, which can only be that God Himself spoke to him directly without the agency of angel Jibra'īl. All the exegesists agree that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) heard what God said with his own ears, but did not see Him. Had it not been so then why did he express the desire to see after hearing the Divine Being? When the talk with God whetted his desire to see Him, he began to urge for it, saying "O God, wherefrom are you speaking? Do bless me with your sight." This is why the Qur'ān says:

And when Moses came to Our appointed tryst and his Lord had spoken unto him, he said, My Lord! Show me (Thy Self), that I may gaze upon Thee. He said: Thou wilt not see Me. (Qur'ān, 7:143)

وَلَمَّا جَآءَ مُوسَىٰ لِمِيقٰتِنَا وَكَلَّمَهُۥ رَبُّهُۥ قَالَ
رَبِّ أَرِنِىٓ أَنظُرْ إِلَيْكَ ۚ قَالَ لَن تَرٰىنِى ۔ اعراف ۱۴۳

Here *kallamahū* (spoke to Him) is subordinate to (*lammā*) and *qāla Rabb-i arinī* is the reply to the latter. Thus the request arose from God's speech. Had the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) seen God during the talk, then why should he have asked for a vision and why should God the Almighty have said "لن ترانى" (*Lan tarānī*) and not "قد رآيت" (*qad raayt-a*) "You have seen"? The question arises whether Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) had a sight of God or not after the request, or before or during unconsciousness, and the request was fulfilled or not. Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn ibn Al-'Arabī and other mystics believe that he did see God and his desire was fulfilled but majority of scholars believe that even at that moment God was not sighted, and the text of the Qur'ān also testifies to this fact because Divine manifestation was tied up with the condition "فان استقر مكانه فسوف ترانى" "If it (the mountain) stand still in its place then thou wilt see me. (Qur'ān, 7:143)

This condition could not be fulfilled. It has therefore been said "جعله دکا" (*ja'lahū dakkan*). Secondly, when later on Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) regained consciousness and said "تبت اليک" "I turn unto Thee repentant," God the Almighty replied :

O Moses! I have preferred thee above mankind by My messages and by My speaking (unto thee). (Qur'ān, 7:144)	يَا مُوسَىٰ إِنِّي اصْطَفَيْتُكَ عَلَى النَّاسِ بِرِسٰلٰتِي وَبِكَلَامِي ۖ (الاعراف، آیت ۱۴۴)

Here in the context of Divine Favour only apostleship and accosting have been mentioned. If this were accompanied by vision, this would have been the greatest conferment of favour upon the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). This is one instance of talking from behind a curtain. Another is provided by the Holy Prophet's Ascension beyond *Sidratul-Muntahā*, where he conversed with the Almighty but did not see Him. There has been difference of opinion among the Companions as to whether the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did have sight of God or not during Ascension but they were generally of opinion that he did not have a vision. Only Ibn 'Abbās and some Companions establish the fact that he did have a vision.

This might lead to the question that if the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) also spoke to God as Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) did, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) should also be given the title of *Kalīm Allāh*. The answer to this is that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) combined in himself the excellences and miracles of all the prophets. Mūsā's distinction is with respect to other prophets, one difference being that he had the privilege of talking to God in this very world. But the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was called away from the world for this purpose. This obviates the misgiving that Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) has precedence over the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). An illustration would clear this up. Supposing a king sets out for hunting or on an excursion and casually speaks to someone. This is one way of talking. On the other hand, if he sends for someone through a messenger, making royal arrangements for reception, and then speaks to him, there is a world of difference in both.

The third type of *waḥī* "يرسل رسولا فيوحى باذنه" is the one in which an angel acts as messenger. Here "رسولاً" (messenger) means the angel who acts as a messenger and takes the *waḥī* to the human messenger on God's behest. This type of *waḥī* is further classified into two kinds: one in which the angel used to appear before the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in human form, and was physically seen by him; the second in which the angel descended upon the heart of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and he could see him with his inner eye.

The answer is that the first type of *waḥī* is not confined to a prophet because the mystics too have the like. The second one was not common but rare. There are only two examples of this, those of Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)[1]; here we are concerned only with that type of *waḥī* which used to come frequently.

---

[1] There is considerable resemblance between the life events of the Prophet Mūsā (*'alaihi al-salām*) and the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) in so many respects. This resemblance has been brought out in a number of ways by the Qur'ān. It has been said in *sūrah Muzzammil:* Indeed we have sent to you a Prophet who bears witness unto you just as We sent a messenger to Pharaoh. For this reason, God the Almighty has repeated the story of Prophet Mūsā (*'alaihi al-salām*) over and over again in the Qur'ān.

3. We have been told by Yaḥyā bin Bukayr that Layth heard it from 'Aqīl bin Khālid who had it narrated to him by Ibn Shihāb Zuhrī on the authority of 'Urwah bin Zubayr

✱ Who reported from 'Umm al-Mu'minīn Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah (*raḍiallāho 'anhā*) who said :

"The commencement of the divine inspiration to the Apostle of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) was in the form of true vision which he saw in his dreams. Hence whatever dreams he saw came to him as clearly as morning light. Then he was made fond of solitude and used to remain in seclusion in the cave of *Ḥirā*. He worshipped (Allāh) for nights together ere he felt an urge for his family; took his meals with him for the duration, and then came back to Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (*raḍiallāho 'anhā*) only to take his food likewise again till the Truth dawned upon him whilst he was in *Ḥirā*. So the Angel came unto him and said 'Read.' He said to the Angel 'I am unable to recite.'

"The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) further said: 'The angel caught hold of me and pressed me hard till it became unbearable. Then he released me and said again: 'Read.' I again replied: 'I am unable to recite.' He again caught me and pressed me once more till I could stand it no longer. He then released me and said 'Read.' I replied as before: 'I am unable to recite.' He then caught me for the third time, pressed me, and, then releasing me, said : 'Read in the name of thy Lord, Who createth man from a clot. Read: And thy Lord is the most Bounteous.' The Apostle of God returned with these *āyāt* with his heart beating hard. So he came to Ḥaḍrat Khadījah bint Khuwaylid (*raḍiallāho 'anhā*), saying 'Cover me! Cover me!' He was covered up till his fear was over. Then he told Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (*raḍiallāho 'anhā*) all that had happened, saying: 'I had mortal fear of my life.' Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (*raḍiallḥho 'anhā*) said : 'No, by God, the Lord shall never disgrace you. You certainly treat well your kindred, bear the burden (of the poor), earn for the destitute, are hospitable and help those deserving ones who suffer from misfortunes.'

"Ḥadrat Khadījah (*raḍiallāho 'anhā*) then took him along to her cousin, Waraqah bin Nawfal bin Asad bin 'Abd al-'Uzzā, who had turned Christian during pre-Islamic days and used to write in the Hebrew script. He used to transcribe in Hebrew from the Gospel whatever God wished him to. He was an old man who had lost his eyesight. Ḥadrat Khadījah (*raḍiallāho 'anhā*) said to him: 'O my cousin, hear what your nephew has to say.' Waraqah asked, 'O nephew of mine, what is it you have seen?' The Apostle

3 حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ بُكَيْرٍ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا اللَّيْثُ
عَنْ عُقَيْلٍ عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ عَنْ عُرْوَةَ بْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ
عَنْ عَائِشَةَ أُمِّ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا أَنَّهَا
قَالَتْ أَوَّلُ مَا بُدِئَ بِهِ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ مِنَ الْوَحْيِ الرُّؤْيَا الصَّالِحَةُ فِي النَّوْمِ
فَكَانَ لَا يَرٰى رُؤْيَا إِلَّا جَاءَتْ مِثْلَ فَلَقِ الصُّبْحِ
ثُمَّ حُبِّبَ إِلَيْهِ الْخَلَاءُ وَكَانَ يَخْلُو بِغَارِ حِرَاءٍ
فَيَتَحَنَّثُ فِيهِ وَهُوَ التَّعَبُّدُ اللَّيَالِيَ ذَوَاتِ الْعَدَدِ
قَبْلَ أَنْ يَنْزِعَ إِلٰى أَهْلِهِ. وَيَتَزَوَّدُ لِذٰلِكَ ثُمَّ
يَرْجِعُ إِلٰى خَدِيجَةَ فَيَتَزَوَّدُ لِمِثْلِهَا حَتّٰى جَاءَهُ
الْحَقُّ وَهُوَ فِي غَارِ حِرَاءٍ فَجَاءَهُ الْمَلَكُ فَقَالَ اقْرَأْ
قَالَ فَقُلْتُ مَا أَنَا بِقَارِئٍ قَالَ فَأَخَذَنِي فَغَطَّنِي
حَتّٰى بَلَغَ مِنِّي الْجَهْدَ ثُمَّ أَرْسَلَنِي فَقَالَ اقْرَأْ
فَقُلْتُ مَا أَنَا بِقَارِئٍ فَأَخَذَنِي فَغَطَّنِي الثَّانِيَةَ
حَتّٰى بَلَغَ مِنِّي الْجَهْدَ ثُمَّ أَرْسَلَنِي فَقَالَ اقْرَأْ
فَقُلْتُ مَا أَنَا بِقَارِئٍ فَأَخَذَنِي فَغَطَّنِي الثَّالِثَةَ ثُمَّ
أَرْسَلَنِي فَقَالَ اقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ،
خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقٍ، اقْرَأْ وَرَبُّكَ الْأَكْرَمُ
فَرَجَعَ بِهَا رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَرْجُفُ
فُؤَادُهُ، فَدَخَلَ عَلٰى خَدِيجَةَ بِنْتِ خُوَيْلِدٍ فَقَالَ
زَمِّلُونِي زَمِّلُونِي فَزَمَّلُوهُ حَتّٰى ذَهَبَ عَنْهُ الرَّوْعُ
فَقَالَ لِخَدِيجَةَ وَأَخْبَرَهَا الْخَبَرَ- "لَقَدْ خَشِيتُ
عَلٰى نَفْسِي. فَقَالَتْ خَدِيجَةُ كَلَّا وَاللّٰهِ مَا يُخْزِيكَ
اللّٰهُ أَبَدًا إِنَّكَ لَتَصِلُ الرَّحِمَ وَتَحْمِلُ الْكَلَّ وَ
تَكْسِبُ الْمَعْدُومَ وَتَقْرِي الضَّيْفَ وَتُعِينُ عَلٰى
نَوَائِبِ الْحَقِّ، فَانْطَلَقَتْ بِهِ خَدِيجَةُ حَتّٰى
أَتَتْ بِهِ وَرَقَةَ بْنَ نَوْفَلِ بْنِ أَسَدِ بْنِ عَبْدِ الْعُزّٰى
ابْنَ عَمِّ خَدِيجَةَ، وَكَانَ امْرَأً تَنَصَّرَ فِي الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ
وَكَانَ يَكْتُبُ الْكِتَابَ الْعِبْرَانِيَّ فَيَكْتُبُ مِنَ الْإِنْجِيلِ
بِالْعِبْرَانِيَّةِ مَا شَاءَ اللّٰهُ أَنْ يَكْتُبَ وَكَانَ شَيْخًا
كَبِيرًا قَدْ عَمِيَ، فَقَالَتْ لَهُ خَدِيجَةُ يَا ابْنَ عَمِّ

of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) related whatever he had observed. Waraqah said : 'This is the same repository of secrets who used to bring revelation to Mūsā (*'alaihi al-salām*). I wish I were young and strong during the time of your prophethood. I wish I could live up to the time when your people would drive you out.' The Apostle of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) asked, 'Will they drive me out?' Waraqah replied, 'Yes; no one has ever come with the type of call you have come and not been treated with hostility. If I happen to live upto the time you will be driven out, I will lend you strong support.' Then Waraqah died after a few days. The Qur'ānic revelation also ceased for a while."

Ibn Shihāb narrates on the authority of Abū Salamah bin 'Abd al-Raḥmān that talking about the period of cessation in revelation Jābir bin 'Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī (*raḍiallāho 'anho*) reported a statement of the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) : "Once when I was walking, all of a sudden I heard a voice from Heaven. When I looked up I saw the same Angel that had come to me at *Ḥirā* sitting on a chair between the sky and the earth. I came back home in fear and said: Wrap me, wrap me (in a blanket). And then God the Almighty revealed the following verses: يا ايها المدثر قم فانذر و ربک فکبر و ثيابک فطهر و الرجز فاهجر O thou enveloped in thy cloak, arise and warn! Thy Lord magnify, thy raiment purify, pollution shun. And show not favour, seeking worldly gain"[1]

(Ibn Shiāb says) thereafter *waḥī* began to descend feverishly in quick succession.

(Imām Bukhārī has said that) 'Abd Allāh bin Yūsuf Abū Ṣāliḥ has followed Yaḥyā bin Bukayr and Hilāl bin Raddād has followed 'Aqīl through Zuhrī. In the version of Yūnus and Ma'mar the expression يرجف بوادره occurs in place of يرجف فواده

اسمع من ابن اخيك فقال له ورقة يا ابن اخي! ماذا ترى؟ فاخبره رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خبر ما رأى، فقال له ورقة هذا الناموس الذي نزل الله على موسى، يا ليتني فيها جذعا، يا ليتني اكون حيا اذ يخرجك قومك، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم او مخرجي هم قال نعم لم يأت رجل قط بمثل ما جئت به الا عودي وان يدركني يومك انصرك نصرا مؤزرا ثم لم ينشب ورقة ان توفي وفتر الوحي، قال ابن شهاب واخبرني ابو سلمة بن عبد الرحمن ان جابر بن عبد الله الانصاري قال وهو يحدث عن فترة الوحي فقال في حديثه بينا انا امشي اذ سمعت صوتا من السماء فرفعت بصري فاذا الملك الذي جاءني بحراء جالس على كرسي بين السماء والارض فرعبت منه فرجعت فقلت زملوني زملوني فانزل الله تعالى يا ايها المدثر قم فانذر وربك فكبر وثيابك فطهر والرجز فاهجر فحمي الوحي وتتابع، تابعه عبد الله بن يوسف وابو صالح وتابعه هلال بن رداد عن الزهري وقال يونس ومعمر بوادره،

The *ḥadīth* is one of the *mursal Aḥādīth* due to Ḥaḍrat Āyishah (رضی الله عنها) inasmuch as it relates the conditions of the earlier days of the Prophet's apostleship and the *mursal Aḥādīth* of the Companions have complete veridicality because Ḥaḍrat Āyishah (رضی الله عنها) reports either from some Companion, and all the Companions are just: "والصحابه کلهم عدول", their statements do not suffer detraction if they are not equally knowledgeable or, Ḥaḍrat Āyishah (رضی الله عنها) might have heard directly from the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) but we cannot say anything definitely. However, there is no difference about the veridicality of the *mursal Aḥādīth* of the Companions. Some writers of today who want to belittle such *Aḥādīth* are wrong as Ummul Mu'minīn 'Āyishah (رضی الله عنها) says :

اول ما بدئ به رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من الوحي الرؤيا الصالحة

"The first thing with which the *waḥī* began to descend on the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) were true dreams and whatever he saw in a dream came to pass exactly as it was observed.

---

[1] Qur'ān, 74:1-5.

Thus the Apostle of God was inducted into the realm of Apostleship through the medium of true dreams. In certain texts of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* the word *ṣādiqah* occurs in place of *ṣāliḥah*. These dreams have been further qualified by the statement "فكان لا يرى رويا الا جاءت مثل فلق الصبح" "Whatever the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) dreamt had an explicit and transparent meaning just as the light that appears at the break of the day is clear and unclouded." There was no difficulty in interpreting them as is commonly the case with the interpretation of dreams. In sum, the Prophet's dreams were not in the nature of "مانحن بتاويل الاحلام بعالمين" that is, such as can not be understood, but were clear and true like the light of the morning. These were three: *ṣāliḥah*, *ṣādiqah*, and *wāḍiḥah*.

The *ṣāliḥah* is that whose external form and interpretation are both pleasant. It should be free from all weaknesses. The *ṣādiqah* is not only true but its interpretation is also of like nature. For the rest, it may be pleasant or harmful as in the case of the dream in which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) foresaw the martyrdom of Muslims and their suffering an apparent defeat once.

The dream was that when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) took up a sword to slaughter a cow, it broke into two. Although this apparently imported harm to the Muslims, yet it corresponds to facts. Hence it was no doubt true but not beneficent. A *wāḍih* (lucid) dream is that which has an absolutely clear and transparent significance. There used to be no complications whatsoever in the interpretation of the Prophet's dreams as is generally the case with dreams. Muslim has reported that before the commencement of *waḥī* the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)used to hear a mysterious voice: "يسمع الصوت و يرى الضوء" "He hears a sound and sees light." The stones and trees used to offer the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) salutation. Therefore the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said that he recognised the stone that greeted him.

"Whatever the Prophet of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) فَكَانَ لَا يَرٰى رُؤْيَا اِلَّا جَآءَتْ مِثْلَ فَلَقِ الصُّبْحِ saw in a dream would manifest itself like the light of the morning." This simile is meant for elucidation. The word *falaq* means to cleave, to burst open. Delineating God's Majesty and Prowess the Qur'ān says :

> Lo ! Allāh (it is) Who splitteth the grain of corn and the date-stone (for sprouting). (Qur'ān, 6:96)
>
> اِنَّ اللّٰهَ فَالِقُ الْحَبِّ وَالنَّوٰى

The dawn is called the "فلق الصبح" (daybreak) since it appears after cleaving the darkness of the night. Ibn-i-Abī Ḥajarah has written a commentary on the *Muntakhab al-Bukhārī* under the title of *Bahjat al-Nufūs* from which Ḥāfiẓ Ibn-i Ḥajar has reproduced certain statements. Ibn-i Abī Ḥajarah says that the simile contains this specially fine point and subtle import that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) occupies the position of the sun among the prophets. His prophethood is one that shines over the whole world. All other prophets are like stars. And just as the appearance of the sun heralds the coming of the morn and indicates that the sun is about to rise, similarly these dreams were the heralds of the *waḥī* that was to visit the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) presaging that the sun of prophethood was about to rise. Hence this image of the sun is remarkably fine.[1]

---

[1] The Qur'ān has etched out the station of the Apostle of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) in the *Sūrah al-Aḥzāb* through the expression *sirāj al-munīr* (the bright lamp). In order to bring home the ethereal qualities and excellences of the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*), a sensuous body like that of the sun was brought forth which is as unique in the material world as the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) is in (*Contd. on next page*)

After this the love of solitude ثُمَّ حُبِّبَ إِلَيْهِ الْخَلَاءُ وَكَانَ يَخْلُوْ بِغَارِ حِرَاءٍ was put into the mind of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) so that he remained in isolation from men. Here *khalā'* (خلاء) is a verb, and does not mean vacuous space.

Sequestration in the cave of *Ḥirā*

The mountain *Ḥirā* is today called the *Jabal al-Nūr*. It is three miles from Makkah while going towards *Minā*, on the left-hand side. A traveller in the path of God feels aversion to all things other than God because he wants to turn wholly towards the Divine Being. Since intercourse with men stands in the way of Divine Communion, he feels averse to them. When he reaches the summit of perfection, then he can have solitude even in the midst of the multitude, with no trace of aversion. Moreover, the people of those days were of the worst type. The whole land reeked with idolatry and heterodoxy, and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) by his very nature detested idolatry from the very beginning. Not even his most obdurate and intransigent enemy can prove that he participated even for a moment in matters like this, although he was born and bred in a society with which this was an inalienable way of life. It is but natural that he should feel pained to see this regrettable condition of his own people, and therefore seek seclusion in *Ḥirā*. Why did he choose the cave of Ḥirā? The writers on *sīrat* say that the Prophet's grandfather, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, sometimes used to retire to this cave. Since the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was his heir, he too liked it. One can see the Ka'bah from there and as seeing the House of God is also a form of devotion, three kinds of worship were conjoined : *dhikr* (actual prayer), *fikr* (contemplation), and *naẓar ilā Ka'batullāh* (looking towards the House of God). Anyone who has seen the cave can decide for himself that no better place could have been found. Nature has made a triangular cubicle there in which one person can sit with ease and two with some difficulty. There is only one way to it, that too so narrow that one has to wriggle through it. So the place itself was suitable whether 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib had liked it or not. This might have been one reason, but the real reason was the suitability of the place itself.

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) passed days and nights on end in the cave performing devotional exercises till he felt a longing for return home.[2]

(*taḥannathu*)[3] فَيَتَحَنَّثُ فِيْهِ وَهُوَ التَّعَبُّدُ اللَّيَالِيَ ذَوَاتِ الْعَدَدِ قَبْلَ أَنْ يَنْزِعَ إِلَى أَهْلِهِ means relinquishing an undesirable and unbecoming mode, which signifies worship by metonomy. The word, *ta'bbud-u* does not occur in the

---

the spiritual world. The point of the image is that the material sun rises from the heaven whereas this spiritual sun rises from the earth. If the material sun gives light to the terrestrial world, the spiritual one lights the whole cosmos. The one manifests the material forms and the other highlights the truths; the former lightens organic nature while the latter illumines human nature and intellect. Just as the benefit of the sun is not identified with any special section of men and the effects of its light and heat are universal, in the same way, the benefit of the spiritual sun of the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) is a message of mercy to all without any distinction whatsoever. The difference in rank of the prophet is due to difference in capacity. There is no difference at all in the beneficence and bounty of God. [2] ينزع الى اهله : In the narrative by Muslim, the word, *yarja'* (return to the family) is employed. *Ilā al-ahl* is an expression employed only when a longing arises. تحنث (*taḥannath*) has been translated by Zuhrī as *Ta'abbud* i.e. taking to worship, otherwise its root is *ḥanth* meaning intransigency or breaking an oath. Hence تحنث means the removal of *ḥanth* and is an essential of *ta'abbud* (worshipping). *Ed.*

ḥadīth itself but is an exposition of the word, *yataḥannath-u*, by the narrator which is necessitated by the context in the *ḥadīth* which *dhawāt il-'adad* accentuates. Sometimes the Apostle of (صلى الله عليه وسلم) God sojourned in the cave for as long as a month but not more. The month of *Ramaḍān* has been particularly mentioned. "ينزع or يشتاق" means that the Prophet (صلى الله عيه وسلم) stayed there so long as he did not feel a yearning for his family, and when he felt like going home, he would come back.

Nature of Worship in *Ḥirā*

It has been argued what was the Prophet's mode of worship in the cave of Ḥirā. No authentic *ḥadīth* says explicitly anything in this regard. We have only statements of writers on *sīrat* and scholars on this point. Some have said that this was in occordance with the *Dīn* of Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام). Others hold it to be according to the *shari'ah* of Mūsā (عليه السلام') or Īsā (عليه السلام) while others say there is no need of spotting out any particular *Dīn* because a Prophet is temperamentally a mystic even before becoming a prophet. Therefore it was devotion by means of inspiration from God. Some have yet said that he only used to contemplate, this being the only worship, or that it was a vigil. But what seems to be the best and soundest hypothesis is that he prayed according to the *reliqua* of Prophet Ibrāhīm's *sunnah*. Therefore in some statements reported in the *sīrat* by Ibn Hishām, the word, يتحنف (*yataḥannaf*) occurs, that is, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) followed the rituals of Prophet Ibrāhīm's religion because تحنف means the pursuance of the faith of Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام). Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has cited the stance of some lexicographers that the Arabs often substitute *thā* for *fā*. Hence "يتحنف" *yataḥannaf* was converted into "يتحنث" *yataḥannath*. Even if this were not so, the tenor of the words shows that "يتحنث" really means "يتحنف."

This means that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) used "ويتزود لذالک" to take his rations with him showing that the effects of life should never be abjured. The relinquishing of worldly effects does not mean trust in God but utter impassiveness.

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "ثم يرجع الى خديجة فيتزود لمثلها" would then come back to Ḥaḍrat Khadījah and take a few days' more ration because leaving one's family in order to live in the wilderness is asceticism which is against nature and Divine intent because it is detrimental to the preservation of mankind which is dependent upon a natural mode of life, and the endurance of mankind is not only essential but is in accord with the dictates of wisdom. Asceticism again becomes a cause of disorder because how can the natural instincts and impulses of man be suppressed and how long? The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was a man of perfectly sound nature, therefore he remained safe from asceticism, avoiding it scrupulously.

Overwhelming Zeal in Search of Truth

The restlessness and overwhelming spiritual passion which seized the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) arose from exceedingly intense ardour because when anything wholly dominates one's mind, one wanders about restlessly under its overmastering sway so that the more the time for its attainment draws near, the more one's fervour and restlessness increase.

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has been told about this very state in the Qur'ān:

Did He not find thee wandering and direct (thee)? (Qur'ān, 93:7)	وَوَجَدَكَ ضَآلًّا فَهَدٰى ۝ (الضحیٰ، آیت ۷)

The word "ضلال" (*Ḍalāl*) also means that one should be caught up in overwhelming passion for something, as was the case with Prophet Ya'qūb (عليه السلام) in respect of his son Prophet Yūsuf (عليه السلام).

(Those around him) said : By Allāh,
Lo ! Thou art in thine old aberration.
(Qur'ān, 12:95)

قَالُوْا تَاللّٰهِ اِنَّكَ لَفِيْ ضَلٰلِكَ الْقَدِيْمِ (يوسف آيت ٩٥)

Prophet Ya'qūb's sons told him that he was still distracted by the frantic love of his son Yūsuf (عليه السلام). On the other hand, see how Yūsuf (عليه السلام) had been all the time in Egypt but Ḥaḍrat Ya'qūb (عليه السلام) never once felt his smell. Only when his shirt was on the way and the time for meeting him was drawing near, did he begin to feel it. Similarly, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was restless in the quest of truth and the more the time for attaining it drew near, the more his restlessness and passion aggravated. It is apropos of this that has been said : "و وجدک ضالا فهدیٰ" that is, when God found him seized with such tremendous ardour and overpowering passion, he gave him what he was seeking. This is why it has been said elsewhere :

Thou knewest not what the Scripture was, nor what the Faith. But We have made it (the Qur'ān) a light. (Qur'ān, 42:52)

مَا كُنْتَ تَدْرِيْ مَا الْكِتٰبُ وَلَا الْاِيْمَانُ
وَلٰكِنْ جَعَلْنٰهُ نُوْرًا (الشورٰى، آيت ٥٢)

This *āyah* and the preceding one are reminders of the conferment by God of that great Gift—the *waḥī*. Moreover, this sequestration was by way of preliminary induction into and succour for the receipt of *waḥī*, an analogous command having been given to Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) also to segregate himself for forty days.

This points to the arrival of the True Message حَتّٰى جَآءَهُ الْحَقُّ وَهُوَ فِيْ غَارِ حِرَآءٍ unexpectedly and unawares in the cave of *Ḥirā*. That is why in some texts *Faja' al-Ḥaq* occurs instead of *Jā'a*. *Faja' al-Ḥaq* means the advent of something all of a sudden, while *al-Ḥaq* means *waḥī*, that is the Truth came up suddenly.

This describes the arrival of the Angel who فَجَآءَهُ الْمَلَكُ فَقَالَ اِقْرَاْ asked him to read. This command pertained to the message Angel Jibra'īl had brought. What was previously being given only in a preliminary and preparative form by way of hints and suggestions from above had now been concretized, and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was face-to-face with it.

The Interpretation of *Mā Anā Bi-Qāri'īn.*

Some exegesists believe that *mā*, on the first occasion, signifies negation and on the second query. They quote a *mursal ḥadīth* due to 'Umayr bin 'Ubayd which has been reproduced by Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar. According to this report, when Angel Jibra'īl again said, "Read," the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, in reply as before, "ماذا اقرأ" "What shall I read?" Then Angel Jibra'īl said, "بسم الله" "In the Name of Allāh." In other texts it is stated that Angel Jibra'īl read *Ā'ūdhu Billāh* (I seek refuge with Allāh) together with the whole of the *Sūrah Fātiḥah*. This *mursal ḥadīth* will be discussed later. What suffices here is that (*mā dhā*) clearly argues for interrogation, but to consider *mā* occurring in Bukhārī's narration an interrogative is against the usage and grammar of Arabic. In Imām Bukhārī's text all the three *mā's* are negative. Some translate these words as 'I am not read' and though the translation is correct, it is not so pertinent as the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) could not have been a stranger to eloquent Arabic, belonging as he did not only to the noblest tribe of Arabia, the Quraysh, but to the Banū Hāshim. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was only asked to recite a small *āyah* in his mother tongue. So how was it possible that he should say he was unlettered? The proper and correct translation of the sentence would be, "I cannot recite." He expressed his inability because of his perturbation and excitement due to the ponderous nature of *waḥī* or all those extraordinary experiences.

فَغَطَّنِي حَتّٰى بَلَغَ مِنِّي الْجُهْدَ

That is, the angel pressed the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) so hard that it reached the limit of his power to bear it. If *juhd* is read as *jahd*, that is as an accusative, the meaning would be that the pressure reached the farthest limit of tolerance by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and if it had exceeded in a slight degree it would have been beyond tolerance. If read as *juhd*, that is, as a nominative, this would mean he was pressed by the angel with full force (that is, this is how it seemed to him), otherwise Angel Jibra'īl possesses such tremendous power that he lifted the city[1] of the people of Prophet Lūṭ (عليه السلام) in the fold of a single wing. The aim, in any case, is to produce a very heightened effect by means of a hyperbole.

It would thus be seen that there was something heavy and ponderous because of which, despite belonging to the noblest tribe of Arabia, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) expressed his inability to recite Arabic words. Jibra'īl's pressing him provided a means for facilitating the recitation and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) began to recite. Shiblī and other writers have expressed surprise on this, saying such a thing is incomprehensible. This stance is far from being sound because experience shows that sometimes matters are facilitated by pressing closely[2].

In the present case when Jibra'īl gripped the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and light came into contact with light, then, initially, much difficulty was felt but when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was pressed hard, the tough thing became smooth.

فَقَالَ اقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الخ

That is, "Read in the name of your Lord." Here also, as in the *ba* of *Bi ism-i Allāh*, there is the famous controversy between Bayḍāwī and Zamakhsharī. *Ba* is employed either as an adjunct in companionship or assistance, but the sum total of both should amount to the same thing, meaning, "You do not have the capacity to do it on your own, so you should read through God the Almighty's help." Again, in place of "بسم الله", "باسم ربک" has been said, since we can neither visualize the Personality nor the Attributes of God the Almighty. However, the Attributes are indicative of the Personality, and the Names point to the Attributes of God. Only through the medium of these Names can we seek an approach towards God, and these are the only links between the Creator and the created, the Primeval and the temporal, the Necessary and the contingent. Thus we can, if any approach is possible to an understanding of God, seek the prop of these Names. God has therefore shown through the very first *waḥī* how to invoke Him and His succour.

The lexicographic meaning of *Rabbik-a* also needs elaboration. Who is *Rabb*? According to Imām Rāghib, God the Almighty is the Being that takes another thing gradually to a stage of perfection for which it is fit and for which it possesses the requisite capacity. The real *Rabb* is only God and the word is exclusively applied, without any compounding, to Him only, since He alone is the Perfect

---

[1] That is, Sodom and Gomorrah of the Old Testament (Genesis, 19:24-25). [2] For an interesting personal experience of the author, vol. 1, p. 166 of the original work may please be seen. *Ed.*

Rabb. Lexicographically, however, everyone who fosters someone could be called *Rabb*, and, on this consideration, the word, *Rabb*, can be used in the genetive case and for mortals also. Here the use of the possessive in "ربک" has been made to remind the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) with what distinctive and special-most attention he was fostered and trained for forty years so that everyone, irrespective of whether he supported the false or true, was friend or foe, would be convinced the moment he saw him that he was about to be conferred a high status. There are many incidents which show that the prophets are trained in a special manner. Take, for instance, the example of Prophet Mūsā (علیہ السلام). The Pharaoh did not desist from putting to the sword thousands of lives for fear lest Mūsā (علیہ السلام) should somehow survive. But it was nothing short of a miracle that Prophet Mūsā (علیہ السلام) was brought up under the patronage of this very Pharaoh, and that very autocrat whom his mother so greatly feared, sent for her and gladly placed him in her lap. Then how did he grow up and attain manhood, reached Madyan, married, and finally was anointed with Prophethood; all these things have been mentioned at length in the Qur'ān.

As for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), whose coming all the earlier prophets prophesied one after another, and with whom the office of prophethood was to be ended, far more elaborate preparations had to be made. Thus, using the possessive ک (your) in ربک (your Lord), it was intended to refer to all these matters reminding the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) that that very God and Lord who brought about his training was making him read, so that he should start reading with His name.

اَلَّذِیْ خَلَقَ

That is, He who has created all things. Here the object of *khalaq-a* (created) has been omitted because of its being commonly known and comprehended. God has not said "Created you" but "Who created the whole Cosmos." This points to the fact that God is the Creator of accident, essences, and qualities. And, when it is He who has created everything, could He not create in the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) the ability to read? If so, then why do you say, "I do not have the power to read?"

خَلَقَ الْاِنْسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقٍ

Man is created from a clot of blood. The reference is to man's original stuff which is devoid of all apprehension. He is absolutely a witless clod which God has made intelligent and sensible by endowing it with a soul. If God has granted such capacity to a drop of liquid that it should develop so many human excellences, then He who can endow a senseless thing with sense, can He not transform a sensible person into a seer or make an illiterate man read? So, after describing the absolute power of God in these *āyāt*, the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was set at ease that he should not feel upset. So far there was a mention of the possibility only but further on it assumed active form. 'Clot' was used to indicate utter contempt because though scholars differ about the seminal fluid being clean or not, they all agree about the pollution of the blood clot.

اِقْرَاْ وَرَبُّكَ الْاَكْرَمُ

That is, your God is extremely Beneficent. Its incidence has been brought out in the contexts under consideration. The attribute of beneficence has been particularly set forth here because there are two complementary things necessary for give and take; he who imparts should have the necessary assimilative capacity and the imparter should not stint, otherwise there can be no impartation. So in the initial sentences the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was put at ease about one thing, and now he is being set easy about the other. God tells the

Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that forty years of strenuous discipline bear testimony to your ability, and there is no stinting on His part too because the Divine Being is extremely Munificent. There is nothing lacking in His Bounty. So now nothing stands in the way of His bestowal. This is the argument in respect of incidence or effectuation: that God would not let the Prophet's capabilities go waste as He is the munificent of the munificent.

Knowledge was imparted with the pen. Evidently, عَلَّمَ بِالْقَلَمِ knowledge became known through the pen which is the medium therefor. That is when God has the power to teach man through a piece of wood (the reed), can He not impart knowledge to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) through the agency of Jibra'īl? This removes another big misconception. The fact that Jibra'īl is in a way the teacher of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), shows his precedence. The answer to this is provided by the word قلم, pen. For instance, Bukhārī's knowledge has reached us through the medium of the pen but this does not mean that the latter has precedence over us. Bukhārī has certainly superiority over us because the pen in itself possesses no power. It is the scribe's hand that moves it. The angels have the same position in the court of God as a pen. Just as the pen is in no position to swerve from the wish of the writer, similarly angels dare not transgress the Divine intent. So the stance of Jibra'īl is just like that of a pen as between the writer and the person addressed.

A baby brings no knowledge along with it from the عَلَّمَ الْإِنْسَانَ مَا لَمْ يَعْلَمْ mother's womb. It is God who endows it with knowledge. So if God can make a baby learned and intelligent, can He not do so to a grown-up person? All these arguments have been advanced so that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) should feel no hindrance or otherwise think it beyond possibility.

Then the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) فَقَالَ زَمِّلُونِي زَمِّلُونِي حَتَّى ذَهَبَ عَنْهُ الرَّوْعُ asked to be covered with a blanket, which the people did, so that in time his fear subsided. This shows that, when the angel Jibra'īl appeared in the cave of *Ḥirā*, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) felt perturbed.

Perturbation does not mean Diffidence

This has led some to the misconception that the Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) felt misgivings. The reply to this is that we should, in the first instance, keep in view the site, environs and condition of the cave. Firstly, it was situated at a desolate place with no one around. It was a place where not even a bird flew, an awesome place atop the mountain. Then it was the dead of night when the occurrence took place because the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* both clearly show that the descent of the Qur'ān was on the *laylatul-qadr*. It was a pitch dark night, the last night of the month of *Ramaḍān*, there being neither a lamp nor any other luminous thing. In this awesome atmosphere the angel appeared all of a sudden. Then it was not necessary that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) should forthwith recognize him. He knew, for instance, that even a high-spirited Prophet like Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) could not identify Mīkā'īl, Jibra'īl and other angels, despite the fact that he had had contact stretching over years with the angels after he had been graced with *waḥī*. These angels visited him while they were proceeding to destroy the land of Prophet Hūd (عليه السلام) and, on their way, came as guests to Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام). This incident is narrated in the Qur'ān as follows:

Hath the story of Abrahām's honoured guests reached thee (O Muḥammad)? When they came in unto him and said: Peace! he answered, Peace! (and thought): Folk unknown (to me). Then he went apart unto his Housefolk so that they brought a fatted calf. (Qur'ān 51:24-25-26)

هَلْ أَتٰىكَ حَدِيْثُ ضَيْفِ إِبْرٰهِيْمَ
الْمُكْرَمِيْنَ ۘ إِذْ دَخَلُوْا عَلَيْهِ فَقَالُوْا سَلٰمًا ۖ
قَالَ سَلٰمٌ ۚ قَوْمٌ مُّنْكَرُوْنَ ۞ فَرَاغَ إِلٰٓى أَهْلِهٖ
فَجَآءَ بِعِجْلٍ سَمِيْنٍ ۙ (الذّٰريٰت آيت ٢٤، ٢٥، ٢٦)

Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) could not at first recongise them as is evident from 'folk unknown.' Had he recognised them why should he have served them with roasted mutton, since the angels do not eat, and why should he have further said, "Why do you eat not?" And that is not all. Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) was overcome by fear and trepidation. The Qur'ān further has it:

And when he saw their hands reached not to it, he mistrusted them and conceived a fear of them. They said: Fear not! Lo! we are sent unto the folk of Lot. (Qur'ān 11:70)

فَلَمَّا رَآ أَيْدِيَهُمْ لَا تَصِلُ إِلَيْهِ نَكِرَهُمْ
وَأَوْجَسَ مِنْهُمْ خِيْفَةً ۚ قَالُوْا لَا تَخَفْ إِنَّآ أُرْسِلْنَآ
إِلٰى قَوْمِ لُوْطٍ ۗ (ہود، آیت ٧٠)

In *āyah* 74 of *Hūd* we are told: "And when the awe departed from Abraham." The point to be noted here is that the Prophet (عليه السلام) was in his house, amongst his family members; the time was also not that of the night; the angels had not appeared in fearful form but in the guise of handsome youngmen. Despite all this the Prophet (عليه السلام) felt afraid. When, however, the angels told him not to be perturbed, saying they had been deputed by God and gave him the good news of his having a son, only then he calmed down. Similarly, when the angels went to Prophet Lot (عليه السلام), he also could not recognize them.

And when the messengers came unto the family of Lot, He said: Lo! ye are folk unknown (to me). (Qur'ān, 15:61-62)

فَلَمَّا جَآءَ اٰلَ لُوْطِ ِالْمُرْسَلُوْنَ ۙ قَالَ
إِنَّكُمْ قَوْمٌ مُّنْكَرُوْنَ (الحجر، آیت ٦١، ٦٢)

In fact, taking them to be youngmen, he became afraid due to the evil ways of his people:

And when Our messengers came unto Lot, he was distressed. And knew not how to protect them. (Qur'ān, 11:77)

وَلَمَّا جَآءَتْ رُسُلُنَا لُوْطًا سِيْٓءَ بِهِمْ وَ
ضَاقَ بِهِمْ ذَرْعًا (ہود، آیت ٧٧)

It was only when he was put at ease by the angels that he shed off his anxiety. The incident has been set down in detail in the Qur'ān. Similarly, even the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) could not at times recognise Jibra'īl even after the descent of *waḥī* and becoming used to it. The angel came and conversed with him and only afterwards did he realise who he was.

This is borne out by the famous incident in which Jibra'īl asked the Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) about faith, Islam, sincerity, and the Doomsday. In this case, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not recognize Jibra'īl when he came and conversed with him. It was only when he went away and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) despatched a man to fetch him back that he was informed by God that the visitor was no else than Jibra'īl. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) thereupon said: "It was Jibra'īl who came to teach people their religion." Therefore we learn that it is not necessary a prophet should recognise the angel as soon as he appears. It stands to reason that the angels being of another order and unfamiliar, one should be perturbed upon seeing them in spite of their beautiful appearance. This is borne out by many other incidents also. Hence there is nothing strange in the fact that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), sitting in that desolate cave on that lonely night, should be confounded by the unexpected appearance of Jibra'īl. Nor does it show any faltering. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had not ceased to be a flesh and blood person. Hence whatever happened to him in those peculiar circumstances was bound to upset him. Let one who raises the above objection imagine himself sleeping alone in a room and ponder how he would be flabbergasted if confronted by the sudden appearance of an unexpected being.

The Incident of Shaykh Jalal al-Din Razi

It is related of a great scholar, Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Rāzī, that once when he was travelling with a caravan and rain came down, the whole caravan got into a cave and fell asleep. Here the Shaykh had a very strange experience of meeting a jinn which naturally gave him the creeps.

Another Illustration from Prophet Musa's Life

Let us see for further illustration the incident of Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) as narrated in the Qur'ān, which was analogous to that of Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام). He was commanded to throw down his staff on the ground. As soon as he did so, it turned into a python. Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) was quite sure that it was the same staff which he used for his daily requirements, a point which had been established in question-answer, thus: "And what is that in thy right hand, O Moses? He said: This is my staff." (Qur'ān 20:17-18).

Moses also knew that this was that very staff which had become a python and had been made expressly for this very purpose that it would help him perform a miracle. And yet no sooner did he see it become a python than he turned his back to run away fear-stricken. The Qur'ān testifies to this :

But when he saw it writhing as it were a demon, he turned to flee headlong; (but it was said unto him): O Moses! fear not! Lo! the emissaries fear not in My presence. (Qur'ān, 27:10)

فَلَمَّا رَاٰهَا تَهْتَزُّ كَاَنَّهَا جَآنٌّ وَّلّٰى
مُدْبِرًا وَّلَمْ يُعَقِّبْ ۭ يٰمُوْسٰى لَا تَخَفْ ۣ اِنِّىْ
لَا يَخَافُ لَدَيَّ الْمُرْسَلُوْنَ ۝ (النمل آيت ١٠)

And God further said: "خذها ولاتخف سنعيدها سيرتها الاولى" "Grasp it and fear not. We shall return it to its former state." (Qur'ān, 20:21)

Exegesists say that when commanded by God to catch hold of the python Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) had still a lingering fear. Therefore he wrapped a piece of cloth round his hand to catch hold of it although everyone knows that if a python comes to harm someone, the cloth can be of no use. All the same this precaution was inevitable for a human being. Thereupon God commanded Mūsā (عليه السلام) to catch hold of it with bare hands. Then Mūsā (عليه السلام) thrust his hand into the python's mouth.

Shaykh Muhi al-Din ibn al-Arabi's Elucidation

The agitation felt by the Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has been explained by Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn ibn al-'Arabī in a novel way. He is of the view that a sound purpose underlay it. As the Shaykh has mentioned, when Mūsā (عليه السلام) had a confrontation with the magicians of Egypt and the cords and the states thrown by them began to creep like serpents, Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) became slightly afraid on seeing this.

Then lo! their cords and their staves, by their magic, appeared to him as though they ran. And Moses conceived a fear in his mind. (Qur'ān, 20:66-67)

فَإِذَا حِبَالُهُمْ وَعِصِيُّهُمْ يُخَيَّلُ إِلَيْهِ مِن سِحْرِهِمْ
أَنَّهَا تَسْعَىٰ فَأَوْجَسَ فِي نَفْسِهِ خِيفَةً مُّوسَىٰ (طٰہٰ، آیت ٦٦-٦٧)

In this incident Prophet Mūsā (عيله السلام) felt a slight fear because when the magicians also transformed their staves and cords into snakes and his miracle was also of the same type, it was possible that the people might not be able to differentiate between it and magic, and be misled, thereby causing his failure; not that he felt afraid of the snakes made by the magicians. In view of Mūsā's qualms, God buoyed him up with these words:

We said: Fear not! Lo! thou art the higher. (Qur'ān, 20:68)

قُلْنَا لَا تَخَفْ إِنَّكَ أَنتَ الْأَعْلَىٰ (طٰہٰ، آیت ٦٨)

But this apparent fear had a profound effect on the magicians. They guessed that he did not look like a sorcerer because a magician cannot be afraid of another, knowing as he does that this is the self-same staff and cord the spectators having been made to think otherwise by an illusory effect. This point also led the magicians to hasten towards faith. So when Mūsā (عليه السلام) flung his staff and it turned into a python, devouring all other snakes, they, one and all, immediately embraced faith and fell into prostration.

Then the wizards were (all) flung down prostrate, crying: We believe in the Lord of Aaron and Moses. (Qur'ān, 20:70)

فَأُلْقِيَ السَّحَرَةُ سُجَّدًا قَالُوا آمَنَّا بِرَبِّ
هَارُونَ وَمُوسَىٰ (طٰہٰ، آیت ٧٠)

But Pharaoh did not embrace faith although Mūsā (عليه السلام) had been specially deputed for this. However, the magicians became such staunch believers that they did not care for Pharaoh's threat even.

Similarly, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) also felt embarrassed so that intelligent people should understand that what he was saying was not something concocted; he must have met with a supernatural happening. This is why Waraqah bin Nawfal immediately acknowledged his veracity and never felt any misgiving about his words having been fabricated.

Period of Surcease of *Waḥī* and the Prophet's Gloominess

To cut a long matter short, it may be said that the main reason for the misgivings on this score are due to the extreme melancholy of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) after the temporary cessation in the descent of *waḥī*. The angel Jibra'īl would raise his spirit in these gloomy days. The Prophet's psychic condition gives rise to the impression that he was faltering in his mission.

Answer: It is common experience that when a person has tasted something nice and is then denied this cherished thing, he feels downcast and frustrated. Many commit suicide in this state of mind. The very passion of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) rising to a frenzy is symptomatic of his excessive ardour. Jibra'īl heartened the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that he would have the revelation again; its cessation was due to some deep purpose. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسم) never felt any qualms about his mission. His so called faltering was only a momentary embarrassment.

---

[1] For detailed discussion on the subject, please see Vol. 1, pp. 171-72 of the original work.

Ibn Ḥajar has cited twelve statements in elucidating لَقَدْ خَشِيْتُ عَلٰى نَفْسِىْ this sentence but all are to the effect that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was afraid of being killed. If so, what was the ground for fear? What the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said to Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) was that he felt he was about to lose his life due to that awesome experience; not that he was feeling flabbergasted. This is the most plausible explanation even according to Shaykh Abū al-Ḥasan Sindhī. The object of the sentence is only to show the intensity of the experience. This is borne out by what befell even Mūsā and Haroon (عليهما السلام) who were encouraged to go ahead with their mission.

كَلَّا وَاللّٰهِ مَا يُخْزِيْكَ اللّٰهُ اَبَدًا Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) here tells the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that nothing fearful will befall him. This shows the remarkable acumen and confidence of Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها). That is why she assured the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) of his perfect safety. She was aware that he was endowed with such powers that they would lead him to extraordinary achievements. Therefore he should not feel gloomy. ''لايخزيك الله آبداً'': This means that if a man fails to fulfil a mission which he has been assigned, he would be disgraced, for people would say he was unworthy of the responsibility. This is why Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) said that God would not disgrace her husband by leaving him in the *medias res*. Far from it, God would help him, even though the whole world stood up against him, as he had in him the highest qualities of manhood and the best of deportments. God never lets one who possesses sterling qualities to be disgraced, nor can his enemies do anything against him.

اِنَّكَ لَتَصِلُ الرَّحِمَ That is he discharges all his obligations to his relations.

وَتَحْمِلُ الْكَلَّ That is he, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is most kindly disposed towards the crippled, the old and the feeble. *kal*, كل, is one who cannot bear his own burden. The purport, in short, is that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is the helper of the destitute.

وَتَكْسِبُ الْمَعْدُوْمَ The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) invites the poor and the destitute to share his earnings. If the ت (*ta*) is marked with the vowel-point—it means that he earns things that are not there—that is, he has the capacity to earn what he does not possess. It is well known that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was singularly fortunate in trade. ''كان محفوظاً فى التجاره'' "Indeed he was perfectly safe in trade."

If the word is *tuksibu* then the first passive accusative is understood. ''تكسب الغير'' means he distributes his earnings among the poor. "المعدوم" that is the non-existent, is the second understood accusative. In some manuscripts the word, "معدم" occurs as subject, meaning that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) helps the poor earn money. That is, he not only earns but spends on others also.

وَتَقْرِى الضَّيْفَ وَتُعِيْنُ عَلٰى نَوَائِبِ الْحَقِّ "The Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is hospitable and helpful to the poor in legitimate cases." نوائب is the plural of "نائبه" meaning misfortune or accident. Thc word, *ḥaqq-i*, qualifies the nature of the misfortune; only those afflicted by misfortune, through no fault of their own, are helped, and not those who indulge in crimes and invite affliction upon themselves.

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not tell Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) anything and she cheered him up to raise his spirit. Bukhārī's object is to indicate the high character of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

فَانْطَلَقَتْ بِهٖ خَدِيْجَةُ حَتّٰى اَتَتْ بِهٖ وَرَقَةَ بْنَ نَوْفَلٍ Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) took

took him with her to Waraqah bin Nawfal, who was her first paternal cousin. No *ḥadīth* or narration has it that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) himself requested her to take him to Waraqah, thus showing lack of confidence. The fact is that Haḍrat Khadījah (رضی اللہ عنہا) took him on her own to an experienced man like Waraqah who, besides being a relative, was very well versed in the Scriptures.

And Waraqah bin Nawfal وَكَانَ امْرَأً تَنَصَّرَ فِي الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ، وَكَانَ يَكْتُبُ الْكِتَابَ الْعِبْرَانِيَّ was one who had taken to Christianity during pre-Islamic days. He could write in the Hebrew script. Many scholars believe that, when the appearance of a prophet is at hand, there appears among people at large an awakening and the desire to seek the truth. Waraqah bin Nawfal and his companion, Zayd bin 'Amrū Nafayl, father of Sa'īd bin Zayd, one of the Ten Companions given tidings of entry into Paradise, were both disgusted with idolatry and heterodoxy, and set forth, by reason of their sound sensibility, in search of a true religion. They tried hard but in vain. At last Zayd came back and stuck to his belief in the Unity of God. He used to grasp the Ka'bah, saying that he followed the *millat* of Ibrāhīm.

Waraqah, however, continued his quest. At long last he met a Christian anchorite who followed the correct Christian faith. So he became a follower of the real Christian religion. Although there had been general apocapation by that time, but some followed the real religion. These were the scribes who used to write in the Hebrew script and their hobby was to transcribe the Gospel, taking down whatever God willed in the Hebrew language.[1]

The sentence points to the advanced age of فَكَانَ شَيْخًا كَبِيرًا قَدْ عَمِيَ Waraqah bin Nawfal who was very old and almost blind. If this were so, it might be asked, how could he transcribe? One answer is that he was not totally blind but weak of sight, being old. The fact is that this occurrence of blindness came about later on. He used to transcribe before that took place. It does not mean that he was blind even when he used to transcribe. In sum, two salient facts about Waraqah have been indicated: his senility and blindness. Khadijah addressed Waraqah with the words:

يَا ابْنَ عَمِّ "O son of my uncle!" The *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* has "ای عم" (O my uncle!). Nawawī has tried to reconcile both by saying that calling him "ابن عم" "cousin" was in consonance with the actual facts, because he was actually her cousin, and she called him "عم" "uncle" reverently because of his old age, as is the custom in Arabia.

Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has, however, pointed out that it is not proper to reconcile the two. The origin of the *ḥadīth* shows that the *ḥadīth* itself is one and the same but the wording of the various narrations differs.

Hence the actual words must be one of the two: "ابن عم" and "عم". Hence one of them must be chosen. A scholar of the Malikite school of *fiqh* has stated in his commentary on the *Mawāhib ladunniyah* that there had been a distortion in the text of the ***Muslim***. The real expression was "ابن عم" and the word 'ابن' thereof became 'عم' through the inadvertence of some scribe. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has reproduced the statement of a *muḥaddith* containing the text of the dialogue between Waraqah and the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) in the "کتاب التفسیر" "Book of Interpretation" in his *Fatḥ al-Bārī* (Vol. 12, p. 317), according to which, this dialogue ended with: "فلما سمع كلامه، ايقن بالحق واعترف به" "When he (Waraqah) heard what he (the Holy Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم) had told him, he was convinced of its truth and acknowledged it as such."

---

[1] **For an elucidatory note on the Hebrew language and preservation of the Qur'ānic text intact, please see the original work, Vol. 1, pp. 174-75.**

Here the pronoun governing the verb "heard" refers to Waraqah and the pronoun to which the verb "told" relates, pertains to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The words, "was convinced" and "acknowledged as such," are also meant for Waraqah, but 'Allāmah Shiblī has taken them the other way round and availed of the opportunity of slighting the other scholars for saying such things that do not stand to reason, namely that, God forbid, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was dubious about his prophetic station, and was convinced of it only when he heard from Waraqah and acknowledged it as a verity. All this, however, is only a reflex of Shiblī's own mother wit.

Haḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) said to Waraqah : "اسمع من ابن اخيک" "Hear what your nephew has to say."

And Waraqah said: "يا ابن اخى ما ذا ترى" "O nephew ! What do you see ?"

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) narrated all that he had seen. Waraqah said :

"He is the same *nāmūs* (repository of secrets) هٰذَا النَّامُوْسُ الَّذِىْ نَزَّلَ اللّٰهُ عَلٰى مُوْسٰى who used to bring *waḥī* to Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام). *Nāmūs* means one who shares one's secret, and the angels share the secrets of God. He who shares secrets for a good intent is usually called *nāmūs* ; while that who shares them with an evil design is called *jāsūs*. Lexicographers, however, do not differentiate between them. One who shares secrets completely is called *nāmūs*. May be the difference lies only in common parlance. Why "على موسىٰ" *'alā Mūsā*? Why not "على عيسىٰ"? The former would have been appropriate because Waraqah was a Christian.

Some say the Jews deny the prophethood of 'Īsā (عليه السلام) whereas the Christians call him the Son of God instead of a Prophet, but Mūsā (عليه السلام) is acknowledged by both the Jews and Christians. Hence Waraqah has mentioned the latter only. The real reason is that of all the Scriptures before the Qur'ān, Pentateuch revealed to Mūsā (عليه السلام), was the most comprehensive as the Qur'ān affirms: "يحكم بها النبيون الذين اسلمو للذين هادوا و الربانيون والاحبار" "The Prophets and those who surrendered (unto Allāh)—the reformers, the *rabbīs* and the virtuous used to judge therewith."

The reason therefore was that this was the most comprehensive work at that time in respect of injunctions, and the New Testament did not contain many commands—it mostly comprised counsels and episodes. That is why Prophet 'Īsā (عليه السلام) said: "O people, I have not come to alter the Pentateuch but to complete it." In fact, only a few things had been abrogated with the advent of 'Īsā (عليه السلام) due to the inexorable needs of time, as the Qur'ān testifies :

(I come) confirming that which was before me of the *Torah*, and to make lawful some of that which was forbidden unto you.
(Qur'ān, 3:50)

مُصَدِّقًا لِّمَا بَيْنَ يَدَىَّ مِنَ التَّوْرٰىةِ وَ
لِاُحِلَّ لَكُمْ بَعْضَ الَّذِىْ حُرِّمَ عَلَيْكُمْ (آلِ عمران آيت ٥٠)

As for the statements of some in the *Kashf al-Ẓunūn* to the effect that there is nothing in the Pentatench about the *ṣalāt*, fasting, *ḥajj*, *zakāt* and Resurrection, this has been due to the tampering with the text. No doubt, the Pentateuch contained very comprehensive injunctions. Waraqah knew from the study of the revealed books that the last of Prophets (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would also get a thoroughly complete and comprehensive

Book which would be even more comprehensive than the Pentateuch. The Qur'ān says :

Say (unto them, O Muḥammad): Then bring a scripture from the Presence of Allāh that giveth clearer guidance than these two.
(Qur'ān, 28:49)

قُلْ فَأْتُوا بِكِتٰبٍ مِّنْ عِنْدِ اللّٰهِ هُوَ
اَهْدٰى مِنْهُمَا (القصص آیت ۴۹)

Waraqah consequently mentioned Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) and in fact there is some similarity between the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) because of which the prophethood of the former has been compared with that of the latter:

Lo ! We have sent unto you a messenger as witness against you, even as We sent unto Pharaoh a messenger.
(Qur'ān, 73:15)

اِنَّآ اَرْسَلْنَآ اِلَيْكُمْ رَسُوْلًا ۥ شَاهِدًا عَلَيْكُمْ
كَمَآ اَرْسَلْنَآ اِلٰى فِرْعَوْنَ رَسُوْلًا (مزمل، آیت ۱۵)

The similitude lies in respect of comprehensiveness. The Pentateuch was comprehensive in its own day whereas the Qur'ān not only comprehends the beneficiality of all the scriptures but adds a lot more thereto. Hence God Almighty says about the Qur'ān: "ومهيمناً عليه" that is the Qur'ān is the guardian of all the *sharī'ahs* and comprehends all of them. Another point of resemblance is that just as the arch-enemy of Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام), the Pharaoh, perished, so did Abū Jahl, the arch-enemy of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Question: This can give rise to a whim inasmuch as Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has quoted the text of a narrative from Abū Na'īm's *Dalāyil al-Nubūwwah* (The Arguments for Prophethood) in which the name of Prophet 'Īsā (عليه السلام) occurs in place of Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام). If this be so, then all the points mentioned above lose their validity.

Answer: On close scrutiny it would transpire that this incident is not the one occurring in the *ḥadīth* under reference but another, according to which Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) called on Waraqah alone. This enables us to reconcile both, because Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) called on Waraqah twice—at first, all alone, when she narrated the event herself ; then Waraqah mentioned Prophet 'Īsā (عليه السلام) because she was a woman. There were certain points in the case of Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) which she could not have understood then. The second time she brought the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) along with her, he mentioned Mūsā (عليه السلام) so that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) should know how momentous a thing it was because he could understand its subtleties.

Having heard what the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had to say, Waraqah said :

يٰلَيْتَنِيْ فِيْهَا جَذَعًا يٰلَيْتَنِيْ اَكُوْنُ حَيًّا اِذْ يُخْرِجُكَ قَوْمُكَ

"I wish I were young and strong during the time of your Prophethood. Would to God I could live till the time when your people would drive you out." *jadha'* جذع is a young camel nearing adulthood. What Waraqah meant to say was : I wish I remained alive and young till the time when you would encounter all those hardships that a prophet has to face. This shows that Waraqah had become convinced of the Prophet's Apostleship. All are agreed about Waraqah being a Believer blessed with salvation, because so long as he was a Christian he followed genuine and not corrupt Christianity. And when he heard the statement of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he affirmed it. While expressing the wish to help him, he made a promise to that effect. Some *mursal* narratives go so far as to say that he testified to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) being the same prophet who was prophesied by Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام). If this is so, then testification which is essential in Islam, is also there. Moreover, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) saw a dream in which Waraqah wore a white silken dress emblematic of those dwelling in Paradise. According to other narratives, the Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) saw him by the bank of the canal in Paradise. The dreams seen by prophets are in fact *waḥī*. Therefore Waraqah bin Nawfal was indeed a Believer blessed with salvation.

Who First Embraced Islam ?

It is known that the first to profess Islam amongst men was Abū Bakr (رضى الله عنه), among women, Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها), among children, Ḥaḍrat 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (رضى الله عنه) and among slaves, Zayd and Bilāl (رضى الله عنهما). No one has counted Waraqah among the first Believers.

Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn ibn al-'Arabī distinguishes between a *nabī* (prophet) and *rasūl* (messenger) as follows: A *nabī* is one who receives *waḥī* which is confined to his own person, but, when he is commanded to propagate his Faith, he becomes a *rasūl*. He says in the *Futūḥāt* that *iqrā'* was a command confined to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). When the period of intermission extending over three years was over (*vide* Imām Aḥmad's *History*) or two years and a half, or six months, he was ordered :

O thou enveloped in thy cloak, arise and warn ! (Qur'ān, 74:1-2)

يَاأَيُّهَا الْمُدَّثِّرُ قُمْ فَأَنْذِرْ (المدثر، آيت ۱، ۲)

So now the behest is to propagate and warn. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had been thoroughly trained and seasoned for three years. At first when he (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was overcome by the heaviness of *waḥī*, he said to the members of his household : "Cover me! Cover me!" The *sūrahs* named *Muzzammil* and *Muddaththir* are two consecutive *sūrahs* of the twenty-ninth section in both of which the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has been called by the same name. Some accounts say that Quraysh tribesmen assembled in the Dār al-Nadwah and consulted one another as to what appellation should be given to him. Some suggested "soothsayer," others a lunatic and still others a magician, but they could not agree on anything. The last appellation was 'sorcerer.' When the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) heard this, he was overcome by sadness and enwrapped himself in clothes, as a man, saddened and grieved, would quite often do. Upon this God addressed him in these two *āyāt* by way of clemency and caress, as the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had once done to Ḥaḍrat 'Alī saying, "Rise up, O Abū Turāb." This was when Ḥaḍrat' Alī had left home in sulks and was lying on the unpaved floor of a mosque.

Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz (رحمة الله عليه) says that here have been described the conditions for and requisites to *kharqa poshī*—the wearing of rough woollen garments emblematic of derveshhood. With "يا ايها المدثر قم فانذر" apostleship was conferred upon the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and he became a *rasūl*, which implies commitment to a mission. There is no question about his being a Believer of the period of intermission. But if he is called a Believer of the period from which the Prophet's mission commenced, he would be regarded as the first Mu'min and Companion. The scholars have generally said that Waraqah had testified to the Prophet's apostleship before the period of *Risālat* while Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr (رضى الله عنه) and others were among those who accepted Islam after its commencement.

We have said 'generally' because there are many scholars who have regarded Waraqah as a Believer of this very *Ummah*. One of them is Ḥāfiẓ Zayn al-Dīn 'Irāqī; the other is Shaykh Sirāj al-Dīn Balqīnī, both of whom are the mentors of Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar. They have not written any regular book on the Companions, but, nevertheless, have mentioned this fact in their respective works. Those who have written specific books devoted to the lives of the Companions are, *inter alia*, Ḥāfiẓ ibn Mundhir, Ibn Jarīr Ṭabarī, Baghawī, Ibn Qāni' and Ibn al-Sakn. Among the latter-day writers on the subject whose books have reached us are, Ḥāfiẓ 'Abd al-Bir, the author of *Al-Istī'āb-u fī Ma'rifat-i al-Aṣḥāb*, Ibn al-Athīr, author of *'Usd al-Ghābati fī Ma'rīfati al-Ṣaḥābah* and Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar's *Al-Athābat-u-fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah.*

All of them have counted Waraqah as the first Mu'min and a Companion because he not only seconded the Apostleship of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) but also expressed the wish to help him in his cause and gave a pledge for it. On this basis Waraqah has the privilege of being the first Mu'min and first of all Companions. Those who generally do not consider him a Mu'min of this *Ummah* base their view on this that only he can be called a believer who adopted faith after the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was ordered to propagate Islam and extend his cause publicly. Since, according to the predominant view, Waraqah died during the period of surcease of *waḥī*, he cannot be counted in the *ummah*. However, those, who, credit him with this, do so on the ground that he affirmed Apostleship in *esse* when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) received Divine inspiration.

فَقَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَوَ مُخْرِجِيَّ هُمْ

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) asked Waraqah whether his people would expell him. He could not imagine that a person of such high grace, so trustworthy, so truthful, straight of dealing and withal possessing such admirable attributes would be driven out by the people. So far the inhabitants of Makkah reposed full trust in him. They, one and all, called him true and trustworthy. Hence he felt surprised.

Love for Home

A similar incident befell Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr (رضى الله عنه). When he was restrained from reciting the Qur'ān and resolved to quit Makkah, he was taken under protection by Ibn al-Daghnah and stayed back but the people soon came complaining to Ibn al-Daghnah against Abū Bakr (رضى الله عنه) reciting the Qur'ān loudly. Abū Bakr (رضى الله عنه) thereupon replied that he was no longer under the protection of Ibn al-Daghnah but that of God. Those who possess exemplary attributes of nobility are not driven out by people. This is why the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) expressed surprise at the prognostication of Waraqah, saying: Will they turn me out? According to another version, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) kept silent on being told that his people would harass him; only when Waraqah told him that he would be driven off from Makkah, did the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) speak, for love of home and hearth is something ingrained in men.

Finding the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) thus lost in surprise and perplexed, Waraqah replied in view of what he thought would be probable:

لَمْ يَأْتِ رَجُلٌ قَطُّ بِمِثْلِ مَا جِئْتَ بِهِ إِلَّا عُوْدِيَ

"There is no-one who had ever come forth with a call like yours that was not treated with hostility. Therefore, he too would be opposed and people would harbour animus against him. Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) had to leave 'Irāq for Syria ;

Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) had to leave Egypt; and Prophet Lūṭ (عليه السلام) had to abandon his homeland. Therefore the same would happen to you."

أَنْصُرْكَ نَصْرًا مُؤَزَّرًا

"If I live upto those times, I would extend full support to you with all my strength. The word (ازر) (*azr*) means intensity and power and has been used in the Qur'ān in the same sense by Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) invoking God's help in his mission :

> Aaron, my brother, confirm my strength with him, and let him share my task. (Qur'ān, 20:30-32)

هَارُونَ أَخِي ۝ اشْدُدْ بِهِ أَزْرِي ۝
وَأَشْرِكْهُ فِي أَمْرِي ۝ طٰہٰ آیت ۳۰-۳۱-۳۲

ثُمَّ لَمْ يَنْشَبْ وَرَقَةُ أَنْ تُوُفِّيَ

Then Waraqah died shortly afterwards. "ثم لم ينشب" means "لم يلبث" that is, it was not long afterwards that he died and could not get the opportunity to extend the hand of succour to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). There is some difference of opinion as to when Waraqah died. Scholars generally believe that he could not live upto the time when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) called people to his religion. He died during the period of the intermission of *waḥī*. The words "لم ينشب" obviously imply that he did not survive long. In some books on *siyar* however it has been mentioned that he was alive upto the period of the mission and narrations to this effect have been quoted, so far so that it is said when Ḥadrat Bilāl (رضى الله عنه) used to be tortured and he would cry "*Aḥad, Aḥad*" (God is One, God is One), Waraqah would pass by him and say "نعم احد نعم احد" "Verily God is One, verily God is One," and used to express his regret. He could not reach the period of propagation and migration nor that when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was subjected to all kinds of hardship. In the present context "لم ينشب" implies the spread of Islam so that he should get the desired opportunity of lending support to it. But he did not live long enough to realise this desire.

وَفَتَرَ الْوَحْيُ

And "the descent" of *waḥī* also discontinued for some time. *Fattar* means slowed down. This word occurs in the Qur'ān also:

> O people of the Scripture! Now hath Our messenger come unto you to make things plain after an interval (of cessation) of the messengers, lest ye should say : There came not unto us a messenger of cheer nor any warner. (Qur'ān, 5:19)

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ قَدْ جَاءَكُمْ رَسُولُنَا يُبَيِّنُ
لَكُمْ عَلَى فَتْرَةٍ مِنَ الرُّسُلِ أَنْ تَقُولُوا مَا جَاءَنَا
مِنْ بَشِيرٍ وَلَا نَذِيرٍ (مائدہ آیت ۱۹)

Opinions differ as to the period when *waḥī* ceased to descend. Narrations say that this period extended from three days to three years. But on closely examining them it is found that the period was fairly long whether six months, two years or three years. But in any case it was not merely three days because when after cessation, *waḥī* started coming again it did not appear in constant succession but came intermittently, at times ceasing for a month or so as in the case of the incident of *ifk*, that is the period of slander of Ḥadrat 'Āyishah (رضى الله عنها). In spite of this it cannot be equated with intermission. "فترة" "Intermission" also does not signify the total stoppage of all visitations by angel Jibra'īl. As is well known, when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) wanted to throw himself down from the top of the mountain, Jibra'īl used to come and say: "You are truly the Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم)."

The reason for this interruption in *waḥī* seems to be that during this period, the angel Isrāfīl, whose function is to infuse souls, was associated with the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). The Qur'ān is also a spirit as mentioned in the Qur'ān itself:

Thus have We inspired in thee (Muḥammad) a Spirit of Our command.
(Qur'ān, 42:52)

كَذٰلِكَ اَوْحَيْنَآ اِلَيْكَ رُوْحًا
مِّنْ اَمْرِنَا ط (الشوریٰ، آیۃ ۵۲)

Just as the spirit animates our body similarly the Qur'ān instils life into the souls. As the Qur'ān was to be revealed thereafter, Isrāfīl was appointed to maximise the Prophet's receptive capacity.

وَقَالَ ابْنُ شِهَابٍ

That is, Ibn Shihāb has something to say which has been a subject of discussion on ground of authority, a matter mostly of academic interest.[1]

وَهُوَ يُحَدِّثُ عَنْ فَتْرَةِ الْوَحْيِ

That is, here Jābir bin 'Abd 'Allāh Anṣārī was describing the *ḥadīth* regarding the period of surcease in the coming of *waḥī*. Apparently, if "يحدث" refers to Jābir, then the *ḥadīth* will stop short as Jābir has not mentioned the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) himself. The subject of يحدث is not Jābir but the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) himself. This is why Imām Bukhārī, while explaining the *sūrah Iqrā'* in his *Kitāb al-Tafsīr*, has cited this narration on this very authority, saying explicitly: Indeed Jābir bin 'Abd Allāh Al-Anṣārī stated that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said, and he spoke on the surcease of *waḥī.*

In addition, he has quoted this *ḥadīth* while expounding the *sūrah Al-Muddaththir*, and twice in the *Kitāb al-Adab*. Everywhere he has explicitly called it unequivocal.

بَيْنَمَا اَنَا اَمْشِىْ

This narration has been mentioned in the exposition of the *sūrah al-Muddaththir* where the site has been fully specified:

(The Holy Prophet *ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: I secluded myself in the cave of *Ḥirā*; and after completing the days of seclusion I came down and, when I was in the middle of the valley, I was accosted.

قَالَ جَاوَرْتُ بِحِرَآءٍ فَلَمَّا قَضَيْتُ
جِوَارِىْ هَبَطْتُ فَاسْتَبْطَنْتُ الْوَادِىَ فَنُوْدِيْتُ

This is the same valley which was sometimes inundated, causing floods in Makkah. Once there was such a flood that people had to swim to the Ka'bah to perform the *ṭawāf* (circumambulation). During the Ottoman period, a dam was built to stanch the flow of the water into the Ka'bah.

"Suddenly I heard a voice from Heaven." Some "سمعت صوتاً" narratives explicitly say that the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) heard the words: O Muḥammad."

فَرَفَعْتُ بَصَرِىْ فَاِذَا الْمَلَكُ الَّذِىْ جَآءَنِىْ بِحِرَآءٍ

"When I gazed upwards, I suddenly saw that very angel who had come to me in the cave of *Ḥirā*. He was sitting on a chair between the sky and the earth." In the exposition of *sūrah al-Muddaththir* the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) furnished full details of the occurrence:

I looked rightwards but saw nothing. I looked leftwards but I did not see anything. I saw in front and could see nothing, nor when I looked behind; then I raised my head upwards.

فَنَظَرْتُ عَنْ يَمِيْنِىْ فَلَمْ اَرَ شَيْئًا وَّنَظَرْتُ
عَنْ شِمَالِىْ فَلَمْ اَرَ شَيْئًا وَّنَظَرْتُ اَمَامِىْ فَلَمْ
اَرَ شَيْئًا وَّنَظَرْتُ خَلْفِىْ فَلَمْ اَرَ شَيْئًا
فَرَفَعْتُ رَاْسِىْ۔

---

[1] Those interested may please consult vol. 1, p. 180 of the original work in Urdu.

فَرُعِبْتُ مِنْهُ فَرَجَعْتُ فَقُلْتُ زَمِّلُونِي زَمِّلُونِي

When I saw this, I again became frightened. Reaching home, I asked the members of my household to cover me with a blanket, saying, "Cover me! Cover me!"

In the *Kitāb al-Tafsīr*, the *ḥadīth* attributed to Yūnus has the word "دثرونی". This has been cited because it was in keeping with the *āyah*: "یا ایها المدثر" although both mean one and the same thing. In the exposition of the *sūrah* in the *kitāb al-Tafsīr*, the following additional words appear: "حتی هویت الی الارض" "Till I looked towards the earth."

And also the following: "فقلت دثرونی و صبوا علی ماء باردا قال فدثرونی و صبوا علی ماء باردا" "I said cover me up and pour cold water on me; cover me up and pour cold water on me."

In the cave of *Ḥirā* After the Advent of *Waḥī*.

Ibn Kathīr has written under the heading: "ولقد راه نزلة اخری" that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) saw angel Jibra'īl in his real form for the first time during the descent of the *sūrah al-Muddaththir*.

This gives rise to a difficulty inasmuch as there was not much interval between the descent of *Iqrā'* and *muddaththir*. The first *sūrah* descended in the cave of *Ḥirā* while the latter descended on the way while coming back from there. So when did the period of intermission come about, although all the *Aḥādīth* establish that interruption of *waḥī* took place after the advent of *Iqrā'*, and the *sūrah Al-Muddaththir* descended during the period of intermission?

Misgiving Removed

This misapprehension arises from the assumption that the *Al-Muddaththir* descended upon him while returning from the cave of *Ḥirā* soon after the descent of the first. This is not necessary, because did the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) never go afterwards to the cave? It is written in the books on *siyar* (Biography) that he used to go to the cave for contemplation occasionally. So he did visit the cave many a time after the descent of *Iqrā'* and when coming back, the second *sūrah* "مدثر" descended on him on the way. This resolves the difficulty.

يَا أَيُّهَا الْمُدَّثِّرُ قُمْ فَأَنْذِرْ وَرَبَّكَ فَكَبِّرْ وَثِيَابَكَ فَطَهِّرْ وَالرُّجْزَ فَاهْجُرْ

"O thou enveloped in thy cloak, arise and warn! Thy Lord magnify, thy raiment purify, pollution (idolatry) shun!" (Qur'ān, 74:1-5)

Dathār is a large sheet, piece of cloth or quilt that would cover the body from head to foot. The object of this exhortation is that the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) should not feel any consternation. His work is to give up all ease and comfort and inculcate fear of God in people and make them afraid of the bad consequences of infidelity and concupiscence. The time for bidding farewell to all worldly comforts and setting about actively in the cause of God has come. *Qum* means to "rise and gird up one's loins." *Indhār* is not warning or threatening in absolute sense, but making people afraid of the impending doom as a consequence of evil-doing. The Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was as much a Warner as a giver of good tidings. Here only admonition has been resorted to because all the people were then infidels and there were none who could be given glad tidings. "وربک فکبر" Here the word does not merely mean the saying of "*Allāhu Akbar*" (Allāh is Great) because the object of the verb *kabbir* has been indicated. Therefore it would not be proper to take it in its literal sense because whenever it signifies the pronouncement "God is Great," the object is not indicated. What is meant is that the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) should proclaim the Greatness of God by word of mouth, act and openly calling to Allāh. "ربک فکبر" "ای عظم" include both these things: that the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) should not only exalt God but inculcate others also to do so. This is the meaning which the *salaf* too have derived from the expression. Some have taken it to be *takbīr-i-taḥrīmah*, that is saying "God is Great" during prayer (*ṣalāt*). I would say that this is but a part of the general reverence we accord to God the Almighty. Hence the general meaning is preferable inasmuch as it suits the intended admonition. One has fear of another only when one has regard for his greatness. Man would fear the lion only when he knows beforehand that it is a powerful animal. If he mistakes a lion for an ox on a very dark night, then, since he has taken the lion for an ox, he has no fear; but, if he mistakes the ox for the lion, he will be afraid of the ox. This shows that to be afraid of a thing depends on the absence or presence of prowess. When, therefore, warning was inculcated through the word, *indhār*, that thing was also ordered upon which fear depends, that is the expression of the Greatness of God. "وثیابک فطهر" "Keep your clothes clean." But this translation is inappropriate because, God forbid, would the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) wear unclean clothes? Prophet Mūsā (علیہ السلام) was commanded to take off his shoes because they were made of untanned leather. How can it be assumed that a person with unclean clothes would receive *waḥī*? Some exegesists have taken *thiyā'b* to be the 'self.' The implication would then be that the inward clothes—the anima or soul—should be kept clean from all polluting elements. The word *thiyāb* or clothes is here used only to suggest that a person is of clean habits and has a good demeanor every way. If we say a person has clean hands, it means he is not tainted and bears good character. Similarly it is intended here to show that a clean person should be clean in his ways and habits though physical cleanliness is not ruled out. Thus, at first, command was given with respect to *indhār*, then with regard to reverence, and finally, inward and outward cleanliness. This is so because only the clean one has the privilege of God's compassion. Proof for this is furnished by an exhortation of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) to this effect:

Keep your courtyards tidy.	نَظِّفُوْا اَفْنِيَتَكُمْ

When jurists enjoin maintenance of cleanliness in one's house, then no doubt this should be attended to assiduously. Similarly if the cleanliness of garments has been enjoined, then the purity of the mind should have prime importance. It is true, dress does not denote the soul but it can be said that if the cleanliness of garments has been ordered, this should *ipso facto* imply cleanliness of mind. "الرجز فاهجر" Bukhārī has interpreted it as continuing to avoid idol-worship. It stands proved that the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) never practised idol-worship. Therefore interpretation in the sense of giving up idol-worship would not be correct. But to my mind this view is only passable but another one has precedence inasmuch as it is more plausible. This is that the word *rujz* is in the sense of *rijz* (punishment), so that the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is enjoined not to do anything which is liable to Divine punishment. Or *rijz* means keeping everything clean. Hence the command of *indhār* is there no doubt but this can be achieved only if God's reverence abides in one's heart and has a dominating effect. Ghazālī illustrates this with an example saying if someone tells us not to eat a thing because it contains poison and himself begins to eat it, then who would listen to what he says? The same is the case with the *mundhir* or warner. It is only when one's heart is full of Divine Greatness and is free from all pollution that he can act as a Warner. How excellent is this Divine system, how admirable the procedure!

Thereafter *waḥī* began to pour in quick succession. فَحَمِیَ الْوَحْیُ وَتَتَابَعَ "فحمی الوحی" *Faḥami al-waḥī* means that *waḥī* waxed hot. When anything starts coming with profusion on a spur and with full intensity, we say it is at a white-heat. This is the real sense of it which is the opposite of the frigidity pertaining to the stoppage of *waḥī*. The metaphor 'hot' shows that *waḥī* began to come in abundance, the word *tatāba*' showing that there was no further interruption worth the name. The word means that the *waḥī* began to come uninterruptedly in great profusion.

Which Ayah Descended First?

This *ḥadīth* also resolves another controversial matter: which *āyah* of the Qur'ān descended first? The general view is that this consisted of the initial verses of the *sūrah Iqrā'* up to "لم يعلم" (*lam ya'lam*). The present *ḥadīth* cited by Bukhārī establishes this. Some believe that the *sūrah Al-Muddaththir* came first. Their argument is based on the following *ḥadīth* quoted by Jābir details whereof appear in the *Kitāb al-Tafsīr*. He says on Yaḥyā bin Kathīr's authority:

Yaḥyā ibn Kathīr narrates: "I asked Abū Salamah as to which portion of the Qur'ān was the first to descend. He said: The one that says: O thou enwrapped in the blanket." When I said again that I had been told that the first to descend was: 'Recite in the name of your Lord who created...' Thereupon he replied: 'I had asked Jābir bin 'Abd Allāh the same question and he replied: "O thou enwrapped in the blanket." I said to him I have been told that the first to descend was *Iqrā'*. He said he would tell me only what he, the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) had said.

قَالَ سَئَلْتُ اَبَا سَلَمَةَ اَیُّ الْقُرْاٰنِ اُنْزِلَ
اَوَّلُ فَقَالَ يَاَيُّهَا الْمُدَّثِّرُ فَقُلْتُ اُنْبِئْتُ اِنَّهٗ
اِقْرَاْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِیْ خَلَقَ فَقَالَ اَبُوْ سَلَمَةَ
سَئَلْتُ جَابِرَ بْنَ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ اَیُّ الْقُرْاٰنِ نُزِّلَ
اَوَّلُ فَقَالَ يَاَيُّهَا الْمُدَّثِّرُ فَقُلْتُ اُنْبِئْتُ اَنَّهٗ
اِقْرَاْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ فَقَالَ لَآ اُخْبِرُكَ اِلَّا بِمَا قَالَ
رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

It would be apparent from this that the *sūrah al-Muddaththir* came first according to Jābir who supported his statement by the words of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself. These appear to clash with the *ḥadīth* due to Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah, (رضی الله عنها). Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Al-Suyūṭī has given five arguments in support of *al-Muddaththir* in *Al-Ittiqān*. Only two of those are worth quoting here (in his own words):

(One of the answers) is that the question was about the descent of a complete *sūrah*. The reply is that the complete *sūrah al-Muddaththir* descended before the first part of the complete *sūrah Iqrā'*. Therefore this was the first *sūrah* to appear.

اَحَدُهَا اَنَّ السُّؤَالَ كَانَ عَنْ نُزُوْلِ سُوْرَةٍ
كَامِلَةٍ فَبَيَّنَ اَنَّ سُوْرَةَ الْمُدَّثِّرِ نَزَلَتْ بِكَمَالِهَا
قَبْلَ نُزُوْلِ تَمَامِ سُوْرَةِ اِقْرَاْ فَاِنَّهَا اَوَّلُ مَا
نَزَلَ مِنْهَا صَدْرُهَا .

To my mind the correct answer depends upon proving that *al-Muddaththir* appeared in full before. Although it stands proved that *Iqrā'* descended in full earlier because the incident of Abū Jahl in which its last portion descended occurred later. But I have hitherto no proof of the fact that *al-Muddaththir* appeared in full despite the fact that its tenor shows that this was so.

To quote Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī again:

The second argument is that what Ḥadrat Jābir (*raḍi allāho 'anho*) meant is precedence in point of appearance after the intermission of *waḥī*, and not precedence in the absolute sense.

ثَانِيْهَا اَنَّ مُرَادَ جَابِرٍ بِالْاَوَّلِيَّةِ اَوَّلِيَّةٌ
مَّخْصُوْصَةٌ بِمَا بَعْدَ فَتْرَةِ الْوَحْيِ لَا اَوَّلِيَّةٌ مُّطْلَقَةٌ

This argument is open to the objection that it is against the context of Ḥadrat Jābir's statement. It was in reply to a problem put before him by a pupil of his that he said: "I would only tell what the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has told me." He does not say that *sūrah Iqrā'* had absolute precedence over *al-Muddaththir* and by saying that *Al-Muddaththir* descended first, he means after the period of intermis sion. Had this been in Jābir's mind, he would not have refuted his pupil's objection but reconciled the two narrations.

On this basis many exegesists have come out with the view that this is Jābir's own interpretation which cannot have precedence over the statement of Ḥadrat 'Ā'yishah (رضى الله عنها) as Kirmānī quoted by Ḥāfiẓ says: "ان جابرا استخرج ذالک باجتهاده و ليس هو من روايته فيتقدم عليه ماروته عائشة" that is, the word, *muddaththir*, occurring in Jābir's *ḥadīth* is his own *ijtihād* and not a factual report of the Holy Prophet's words, and his *ijtihād* cannot be considered more reliable than Ḥadrat 'Āy'ishah's statement. I, for one, fail to understand how Jābir's statement can be called *ijtihād* in spite of the fact that he expressly calls it a statement of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). One version has it: "قال رسول الله صلى الله عيه وسلم وهو يحدث عن فترة الوحى" "The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, and he spoke about the stoppage of *waḥī*."

In another text the words are: "الا حدثک الا ماحدثنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم" "I have not spoken to you except what the Prophet (صلى الله عيله وسلم) narrated to us."

And still in another text the words are: "الا خبرک الا بما قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم" "I have not intimated to you except what the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) spoke."

One more version has it: "سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم" "I heard the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) say......"

All these *Aḥādīth* have been narrated by Bukhārī. In the presence of all these categorical statements how can we call Jābir's statement *ijtihād*? Moreover, it is but an incident and *ijtihād* has nothing to do with it. When we consider the wording of the various versions, we find that the incident of the cave of *Ḥirā* was also present in Jābir's mind and he too knew in a cursory manner that some *waḥī* had descended in the very beginning so that Bukhārī has mentioned the statement of Jābir in the book 'On the Beginning of Creation', in the Chapter on angels, in these words: "آنه سمع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم فتر الوحى عنى فترة" "Indeed he heard the prophet say: "Then *waḥī* ceased to descend on me." Similarly he has said in the *Kitāb al-Adab*, in the chapter on "رفع البصر الى السماء" "Raising of the eyes towards the sky", thus: "Indeed I heard then the Prophet (صلى الله علية وسلم) say: 'then *waḥī* ceased.' The word, *thumma*, meaning "then" clearly shows that he had an earlier event in mind, otherwise, wherefore would *thumma* come, and what incident or event would it relate to? Again, the words by Ḥadrat Jābir (رضى الله عنه) "سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو يحدث عن فترة الوحى" "I heard the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) say and he spoke on the intermission of *waḥī*" or "انه سمع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول ثم فترعنى الوحى" "Indeed I heard the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) say: 'the *waḥī* ceased to come to me," argue in favour of the fact that Jābir knew somewhat about the earlier descent of *waḥī*, as the phrase, 'intermission of *waḥī*,' clearly shows that *waḥī* had once already descended upon the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Furthermore, the words occurring in the narration: "So an angel came to me in the cave of *Ḥirā*," clearly spell out the fact that Jābir knew cursorily about the occurrence in *Ḥirā*, as also that angel Jibra'īl had once visited the place although we do not maintain that Jābir knew fully that the earlier verses of the *Sūrah Al-'Alaq* had descended in the cave at the very outset.

Considering all the channels through which this narration came, to call this an *ijtihād* of Ḥaḍrat Jābir and maintaining that he was quite unaware of the earlier incident, would be highly improbable. Hence, in all fairness, this narration should be taken to mean that when *waḥī* started again, *Sūrah Al-Muddaththir* was the first to descend. As has been said in the *Ḥadīth* that just as Prophet Nūḥ (عليه السلام) was the first of prophets, that is, in the reconstituted world, similarly in the recommenced *waḥī Al-Muddaththir* was the first *āyah* to descend. As to Jābir's reply to Abū Salamah that he was quoting what the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had told him, it is not a rebuttal of what he said but merely a statement of fact: he had but reported what he had received in detail from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). He had laid everything before him and it was for him to draw the conclusion.

Descent of *Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*

The *Fatḥ al-Bārī* quotes a *mursal ḥadīth* to the effect that the first *sūrah* to descend was *Al-Fātiḥah*. This idea appeals to me. It strikes me as if *sūrāh Al-Fātiḥah* descended in the same session as *Al-'Alaq*, since 'Ubayd bin 'Umayd's narrative has "ماذا اقرأ" *madhā aqra'o*" also. Thus it seems that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was first asked to recite, and apparently the five verses of *Iqrā'* at first appeared. Then when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) asked "ماذا اقرأ" "What shall I recite?" Jibrā'īl Amīn said: "بسم الله الرحمان الرحيم الحمد لله رب العالمين الى آخر السورة" "In the name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful. Praise be to Allāh, Lord of worlds, the Beneficent, the Merciful..."

In some texts "اعوذ بالله" "I seek refuge with Allāh" also figures.

Now it is a fact that at no time was Islam without the *sūrah Fātiḥah* nor was so the ritual prayer. Although this *ḥadīth* is of the *mursal* type and does not come up to the standard of the two authentic compilations of *Aḥādīth*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, still its *isnāds* are not below those of a *ḥasan ḥadīth*. Since it has been narrated by Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar, it harmonizes with the demand of ratiocination and logical sequence.

The *Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*: Epitome of the Qur'an

This is so because the *sūrah Al-Fātiḥah* possesses a glorious position and importance all its own. One of its appellations is the *Umm al-Qur'ān* (Spring-head of the Qur'ān). The literal meaning of *Umm* is origin, that is a thing or object out of which another comes forth. Thus the seed is the origin of the plant. The ensign of an army is also called the *Umm*, as the whole army is under its sway. Likewise, a mother is called *umm* because it is in her womb that the child has its birth, Thus *Fātiḥah* is the fountain-head of the Qur'ān and its relation to the Qur'ān is the same as that of the seed to the plant. It is the embryonic form of the Qur'ān—the basic text of which the Qur'ān is the detailed exposition. In the *Ḥadīth* it has been called the sum total of the Qur'ān. This means that the *sūrah* is the quintessence of the different categories of knowledge contained in it.

In mystic terminology, man though a microcosm, that is, the universe in the miniature, is still a resume of all that is in the world. Similarly, the *sūrah Fātiḥah* though just a very small part of the Qur'ān, is so great, so momentous, so pregnant with meaning that it is the precis of all that the Qur'ān is about: the unity of God-head, the ethics enjoined upon mankind, the principle that our acts on earth are requited, the Attributes of God the Almighty, the fact that there are other worlds beyond ours and so on. It can therefore be called the Qur'ān al-Ṣaghīr (the Qur'ān in Miniature). This is why its recitation in every *rak'at* of the prayers has been deemed obligatory, so that the epitome of the Qur'ān may be recited within the compass of a few words. In sum, therefore, *sūrah Al-Fātiḥah* has the position of the text, seed, and foundation of the Qur'ān; and the rest of the Qur'ān is like an edifice that has been constructed on its base: It may concurrently be regarded as its exegesis or the plant that has burgeoned forth from the germ contained in *sūrah Fātiḥah.*

The natural order necessitates that the text, the substance and the basic idea should precede. This very order has been followed in the arrangement of the Qur'ān, placing the *sūrah Al-Fātiḥah* at the head. If it is given this primary position in point of revelation as well, it should be in the fitness of things so that its form and tenor may be apposite and the order of revelation may also be logical and rational.

With this the concord between the narration relating to "اقرأ" (*iqra'*) becomes clear. That is, the earlier parts of "اقرأ" were revealed in the cave of *Ḥirā*. Probably the *Fātiḥah* too descended in this very session consecutively, because "اقرأ" contains the imperative for which there must be something to be complied with—which is logically the matter to be read. This was the *sūrah Fātiḥah*[1].

This point argues for the fact that angel Jibra'īl said: "In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. Praise be to Him who is the Lord of the worlds." Thus the first part of the *sūrah al-'Alaq* appeared as a prelude to *sūrah Al-Fātiḥah* and then, simultaneously, as the text that should logically follow, poured forth the great and magnificent *sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*, epitome and summation of the Qur'ān.

According to general consensus at no time has Islam been without prayer. And it has yet to be proved that prayer can be said without the *Sūrah al-Fātiḥah*. These facts demand that this *sūrah* should have descended in the initial period of apostleship, followed by a period of intermission. The first *āyah* to descend upon the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) after intermission was *Sūrah Al-Muddaththir*. Thus the precedence of *Iqrā'* is a matter of fact and its primacy absolute, while that of *Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah* derives from the fact that it either descended during the same session (and for this reason is called the first to descend) or because it descended to meet the command of *Iqrā'* so that there should be something to recite, and this was the first requisite material for the purpose. The precedence of *Al-Muddaththir* lies in the fact that it was the first instance of the recommenced *waḥī*, that is, it was the first *waḥī* to appear after intermission.

تَابَعَهُ عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ يُوسُفَ

Bukhārī is in the habit of presenting collateral corroboration especially when some misgiving arises. Here the words "I felt fear of life "خشيت على نفسي" have led some to the verge of denying the *Ḥadīth* itself. Imām Bukhārī brings forth collateral confirmation here. This is of two types: complete and incomplete. The first is reporting of different persons from one and the same authority. The second is that in which this process takes place in upper and not the lower or later stages. Here the reference is to Yaḥyā who has reported from Layth in common with 'Abd Al-Raḥmān.

---

[1] For detailed discussion please see vol. 1, p. 185, of the original work.

تَابَعَهُ هِلَالٌ عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ

From these words it appears that the coincidence in reporting is with a pupil of Zuhrī named 'Uqayl. This means that just as 'Uqayl has narrated on Zuhri's authority, so has Hilāl bin Radād. This is an instance of complete convergence in report.

وَقَالَ يُونُسُ وَمَعْمَرٌ بَوَادِرُهُ

Imām Bukhārī (رحمة الله عليه) wishes to point out through these additional words that the subject-matter and not the words are of main import in convergent reporting, and slight changes in words do not matter. In one text the expression is "يرجف فؤاده" and in other "ترجف بوادره". The meaning of the first is that the heart of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was trembling because of the awe of the commencement of *waḥī*. In another text the word "بوادر" *bawādiru* instead of "فؤاد" (*fu'ād*) has been employed. It is the plural of "بادره" (*bādirah*), the flesh between the neck and the shoulder which begins to tremble in fear. Whichever part of the body might have been referred to, the heart or the subject-matter is identical. Yūnus and Ma'mar have been pointed out as two more collateral reporters. With these we have in all four pupils of Zuhrī. The only difference between them is that 'Uqayl and Hilāl report similarly, whilst Yūnus and Ma'mar have used the word *bawādiruhū* instead of "فواده" (*fawāduhū*). All these convergent reporters refer back to Ḥaḍrat 'Ā'yishah (رضى الله عنها).

Concord between the *ḥadīth* and its Heading

The above *ḥadīth* which has been discussed in some detail shows that at first the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was prepared for receiving *waḥī* by means of true dreams. This was followed by fondness for seclusion so that he began to retire in the cave of *Ḥirā*. All these form the preliminaries of *waḥī*. This *ḥadīth* reported by Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah etches out in detail the commencement of *waḥī*. There, it is intended to establish the awesomeness and infallibility of *waḥī* alongwith its apparent aspect. The *ḥadīth* due to Ḥaḍrat 'Ā'yishah furnishes proof for this also, because the majesty of *waḥī* made it hard for the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to bear it. If *waḥī* were not such a momentous thing, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would not have been so greatly distressed by its intermission. The pleasure and majesty of God's speech stimulated the Prophet's eagerness to the utmost. It is but natural that when a person gets some boon, he feels a great longing for its endurance and perpetuity.

Final Remarks

This incident brings home to us the striking personality of Ummul Mu'minīn Ḥaḍrat Khadījah (رضى الله عنها) who possessed qualities of rare order. She had inherited noble qualities which marked her out from other members of her sex.

Other noteworthy points are: (1) The *sūrah Iqrā'* was the first to be revealed. (2) The statement of Ḥaḍrat 'Āy'ishah (رضى الله عنها) establishes the fact that the dreams of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) were in the nature of *waḥī*. (3) While going out on a journey, it would be advisable to take some provisions with us wnich is not against trust in God. (4) Noble qualities prove a shield against calamities. (5) The more excellent qualities a person has the more we can expect him to fare well both here and Hereafter.

4. It was narrated to us by Mūsā bin Ismā'īl who said that it was conveyed to him by Abū 'Awānah on the authority of Mūsā bin Abī 'Āyishah, who said that (the *ḥadīth*) was narrated to him by :

✶ Sa'īd bin Jubayr who heard it from Ibn 'Abbās (*raḍiallāho 'anho*) as an exposition of the *āyah* : Move not thy tongue to memorize the *waḥī* hastily.[1] 'Abbās said : "The Apostle of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) laid great stress on the descent of *waḥī* and often used to move his lips to memorize the revelation." He said to Sa'īd: "I will show unto you how his lips used to move by moving my own lips." And said Sa'īd (to Mūsā) : "I will (now) show unto you as I saw 'Abbās moving his lips. So he moved his lips that way. Ibn 'Abbās then added : "Thereupon God the Almighty sent forth this *āyah*: "Move not thy tongue to memorize the *waḥī* hastily. Lo! upon Us (resteth) the putting together thereof and the reading thereof,[2] that is God Almighty would ensconce it in the heart of the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) and enable him to recite it. Then this inculcation by Allāh that "When We have read it, follow thou the reading," means: 'Listen to it and be silent, inasmuch as the explanation thereof rests upon Us, as also making you recite it.' After that, whenever Jibra'īl came and recited the Qur'ān, the Prophet of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) would keep listening to him quietly and when he went away, he used to recite it just like Jibra'īl (*'alaihi al-salām*).

4 حَدَّثَنَا مُوسَى بْنُ إِسْمَاعِيلَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو عَوَانَةَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا مُوسَى بْنُ أَبِي عَائِشَةَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا سَعِيدُ بْنُ جُبَيْرٍ عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا فِي قَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى لَا تُحَرِّكْ بِهِ لِسَانَكَ لِتَعْجَلَ بِهِ قَالَ كَانَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يُعَالِجُ مِنَ التَّنْزِيلِ شِدَّةً وَكَانَ مِمَّا يُحَرِّكُ شَفَتَيْهِ فَقَالَ ابْنُ عَبَّاسٍ رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا فَأَنَا أُحَرِّكُهُمَا لَكَ كَمَا كَانَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يُحَرِّكُهُمَا وَقَالَ سَعِيدٌ أَنَا أُحَرِّكُهُمَا كَمَا رَأَيْتُ ابْنَ عَبَّاسٍ رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا يُحَرِّكُهُمَا فَحَرَّكَ شَفَتَيْهِ فَأَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ تَعَالَى لَا تُحَرِّكْ بِهِ لِسَانَكَ لِتَعْجَلَ بِهِ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا جَمْعَهُ وَقُرْآنَهُ قَالَ جَمْعُهُ لَهُ فِي صَدْرِكَ وَتَقْرَأَهُ فَإِذَا قَرَأْنَاهُ فَاتَّبِعْ قُرْآنَهُ قَالَ فَاسْتَمِعْ لَهُ وَأَنْصِتْ ثُمَّ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا بَيَانَهُ ثُمَّ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا أَنْ تَقْرَأَهُ فَكَانَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ إِذَا أَتَاهُ جِبْرِيلُ اسْتَمَعَ فَإِذَا انْطَلَقَ جِبْرِيلُ قَرَأَهُ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ كَمَا قَرَأَهُ ❁

Here, Sa'īd bin Jubayr (رضى الله عنه) is reporting the exposition by the prime exegesist, Ibn Abbās (رضى الله عنه), of the *āyah*, "Move not thy tongue to memorize the *waḥī* hastily."

Ibn 'Abbās (رضى الله عنه) has been bestowed the exalted status of Prime Exegesist due to the fact that he was clasped to his breast by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and blessed with the prayer :

God the Almighty! Grant Ibn 'Abbās knowledge of the Book.

اَللّٰهُمَّ عَلِّمْهُ عِلْمَ الْكِتَابِ

This is why whatever statement is proved to have emanated from Hadrat Ibn 'Abbās (رضى الله عنه) enjoys precedence over that of others. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has been directed in this *āyah* not to memorize quickly, as he used to move his lips fast to memorize the revelation. Thereupon this *āyah* came saying that the Qur'ān was God's own Speech and the fulfilment of the object for which it was revealed was God's own responsibility. Hence the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was directed to listen to the *waḥī* with full ease and composure and not to worry about retaining it.

قَالَ كَانَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يُعَالِجُ مِنَ التَّنْزِيلِ شِدَّةً

Hadrat Ibn 'Abbās (رضى الله عنه) says further that the descent of *waḥī* caused great distress to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The word "يعالج" is derived from "معالجه"

---

[1] *Sūrah Al-Qiyāmah* (LXXV), verse 16. [2] *Ibid*, verse 16-17.

meaning undergoing hardship to acquire something. Howmuchsoever ardour is shown in respect of conversation with and praise of the beloved, it is too small. This is why the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would go on reciting with Jibra'īl and at the same time try to understand. It was really hard to get along with Jibra'īl because his means of articulation was that of an angel which the human organs of speech can never vie with. Hence he had perforce to exert himself to memorize which caused all the more strain. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was confronted all at once with several factors demanding severe exertion and causing a high degree of physical and mental strain: the intensity of *waḥī*, memorization, physical movement of the lips, and reflecting upon the significance of what had been revealed. All these physical and mental exertions had to be sustained at one and the same time.

وَكَانَ مِمَّا يُحَرِّكُ شَفَتَيْهِ

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) often used to move his lips. Here "مما" means "ربما" which is often used to mean 'extensively.' Some texts have this version: "كان يحرك لسانه و شفتيه" "He used to move his tongue and the lips."

فَأَنَا أُحَرِّكُهُمَا لَكَ كَمَا كَانَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يُحَرِّكُهُمَا

Haḍrat Ibn 'Abbās (رضى الله عنه) told Sa'īd that he would demonstrate as to how the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) used to move his lips. Here the question arises : How could Ibn 'Abbās (رضى الله عنه) have seen the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) move his lips, as he was born ten years after the commencement of Prophethood and this matter related to a time much earlier? There are two possibilities: either Ibn 'Abbās had heard it from some Companion or the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) might have himself related this to him.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has reported the matter on the authority of the *Musnad* of Abī Dā'ud Ṭiyalisī who explicitly states that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself demonstrated to his cousin how he used to move his lips. This makes it a *muttaṣil* type of authentic *ḥadīth*, and even if not so, *mursal ḥadīth* of a Companion is acceptable according to the Sunnites inasmuch as all the Companions are acknowledged just. Ibn 'Abbās tells Sa'īd he would show him how the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) used to move his lips, and Sa'īd bin Jubayr in turn demonstrates how he saw Ibn 'Abbās mimic the movement of the Holy Prophet's lips. The only point is that Ibn 'Abbās had never seen the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) moving his lips because this *āyah* is from *Al-Qiyāmah* with is unanimously considered Meccan and Ibn 'Abbās was born only three years before Migration. Hence there is no question of seeing the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) at the time the *āyah* descended. But Sa'īd ibn Jubayr is only mentioning Ibn 'Abbās's demonstration of the act.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that the very fact of Bukhārī's including this *ḥadīth* in the Book of Commencement of *waḥī* shows that these verses of *Al-Qiyāmah* belong to an early stage in the descent of *waḥī*. Hence Ibn 'Abbās does not say that he personally saw the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) move his lips, whilst Sa'īd bin Jubayr is just pointing out how he saw Ibn 'Abbās move his lips. Ṭabarī, however, has reproduced Ibn 'Abbās's statement through Shu'abi to the effect that he had seen the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) move his lips. If so, it is no longer necessary to regard this incident as belonging to the earliest period of *waḥī*. Ibn 'Abbās might have heard the exposition of these verses of *sūrah Al-Qiyāmah* from the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) who demonstrated it by the movement of the lips. Thus Ibn 'Abbās demonstrated the movement of the lips while narrating it and Ibn Jubayr similarly demonstrated before his pupils. This is why this *ḥadīth* has been called the "مسلسل بتحریک شفتین" "Continuous with the movement of the lips."

It relates لَا تُحَرِّكْ بِهٖ لِسَانَكَ لِتَعْجَلَ بِهٖ ۞ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا جَمْعَهٗ وَقُرْاٰنَهٗ ۞ فَإِذَا قَرَأْنٰهُ فَاتَّبِعْ قُرْاٰنَهٗ to the *āyāt* 16-19 of *Sūrah* LXXV (*Al-Qiyāmah*: Resurrection.) God revealed an *āyah* to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) directing him not to move his lips to hasten in memorizing the Qur'ān. "It is for Us", says God, "to oversee its putting together in your mind and to continue its recital by you. So when We recite the Qur'ān (through the angel), you should be wholly attentive to this recital. When Jibra'īl brings the Qur'ān from Us, you should go on reading it, spurred by the enthusiasm to memorize and learn it quickly lest Jibra'īl should go away before the *waḥī* has been fully retained. This causes you double exertion. As long as you repeat the first word, the second cannot be heard, and difficulty is felt in comprehending also. Hence there is no need of reading and moving your tongue at the time the revelation comes. You should become all attention and hear. You need not worry how you will be able to read it and thereafter recite it before others if you are unable to memorize it. It is for Us to collect each and every word in your heart and to enable you to recite. You should keep quiet when Jibra'īl recites on Our behalf and not even repeat a single word."

After - إِذَا أَتَاهُ جِبْرِيلُ اسْتَمَعَ فَإِذَا انْطَلَقَ جِبْرِيلُ قَرَأَهُ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ كَمَا قَرَأَهُ this exhortation, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) used to listen very carefully what Jibra'īl said, and used to recite it just like the angel.[1]

A Miracle

That the Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) should listen to the text of the *waḥī* made to descend upon him through the agency of Jibra'īl and then repeat it word for word without the slightest change in the inflections or diacritical marks as also explaining it, is indeed a miracle. This is a slight token in this very world of what has been said in: "ينبو الانسان يومئذ بما قدم وآخر" "On that day man is told the tale of that which he hath sent before and left behind." (Qur'ān, 75-13) In plain words it means that man would be apprised of all his good or bad acts fore and aft. This *āyah* precedes the one in the same *sūrah* pertaining to the direction given by God to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) not to move his lips. Its implication is that if God is competent to preserve the text of the *waḥī* word for word in the mind of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), without the least discrepancy whatsoever, after the angel departs, does it not lie within his power to bring forth all deeds of man before and after, some of which he might have even forgotten, all in a sheaf at one single moment, laying these before them and remind them thereof, and similarly, to collect the scattered bits of their bones from all places, reassemble them, and make them flesh and blood once again?

Correlation of the *Āyāt*

A discussion of coherence between different *āyāt* relates to exposition. But since exegesists have raised the point of coherence of *āyah* 19 of *sūrah Al-Qiyāmah* with other parts of the *sūrah*, we touch the matter briefly. Apparently this *āyah* has no connexion with the portions before and after, and it is hard to explain it in point of coherence because in view of the occasion for its revelation mentioned by Ibn 'Abbās, based upon authentic report, it has no relation with the *āyāt* preceding and following which speak of Resurrection. In between we have an *āyah* relating to a topical matter.

---

[1] A detailed discussion of Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās's statement is given in the *Faḍl al-Bārī* (Urdu), vol. 1, pp. 189-90.

Imām Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī has argued that no contextual relevance is needed here. It is as if a teacher, a lecturer, or a sermonizer sensing something that requires admonition, has come down with one by way of parenthesis and goes ahead with his oration. This admonition will definitely be an interpolation which has nothing to do with what has gone before or will come afterwards. Nor is it against the principles of eloquence and rhetoric. In the *āyah* preceding this one the conditions that will obtain on the Day of Judgment are being described :

He asketh: When will be this Day o Resurrection? But when sight is confounded, and the moon is eclipsed, and sun and moon are united, on that day man will cry: Whither to flee? Alas! No refuge! Unto thy Lord is the recourse that day.

On that day man is told the tale of that which he hath sent before and left behind. Oh, but man is a telling witness against himself : although he tenders his excuses. (Qur'ān, 75:6-15)

يَسْئَلُ اَيَّانَ يَوْمُ الْقِيَامَةِ ۭ فَاِذَا بَرِقَ
الْبَصَرُ ۙ وَخَسَفَ الْقَمَرُ ۙ وَجُمِعَ الشَّمْسُ وَالْقَمَرُ ۙ
يَقُوْلُ الْاِنْسَانُ يَوْمَئِذٍ اَيْنَ الْمَفَرُّ ۚ كَلَّا لَا وَزَرَ ۭ اِلٰى
رَبِّكَ يَوْمَئِذِ ۨ الْمُسْتَقَرُّ ۭ يُنَبَّؤُا الْاِنْسَانُ يَوْمَئِذٍۢ
بِمَا قَدَّمَ وَاَخَّرَ ۭ بَلِ الْاِنْسَانُ عَلٰى نَفْسِهٖ بَصِيْرَةٌ ۙ
وَّلَوْ اَلْقٰى مَعَاذِيْرَهٗ ۭ (القيمة آيت ٦ تا ١٥)

This in a way correlates the different parts. Others say that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) continued moving his tongue upto "معاذيره" (*Ma'ādhīrahū*) and felt wearisome. This caused disturbance in the recitation of the Qur'ān. Hence he was admonished. This would be true if the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was actually moving his lips at that time.

Correlation of different parts of *Al-Qiyāmah* : Qafal's Explanation :

Qafāl's explanation relates to the hasty reading of *A'māl Nāmahs* (scrolls of deeds) by sinners and God's telling them not to do so as it is He who has collected their doings and will read them out so that they can check up and acknowledge their commission. Punishment would then be made accordingly. This explanation goes against the occasion for the revelation of the *āyah* mentioned by the *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

Ibn Kathir's View

A similar explanation has been given by Ibn Kathīr. He says that it is a consistent method of the Qur'ān that the *Kitāb al-A'māl* of all persons is mentioned along with the *Kitāb al-Aḥkām* so that everyone should be convinced of God's justice on the Doomsday. This has been done in the present *āyah* also. Hence its different parts fall into order.[1]

Mawlana Anwar Shah's Comment

Mawlānā Anwar Shāh's explanation is ingenious: that the *āyah* has a primary and secondary meaning. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) used to talk of the Doomsday and his detractors would ask him odd questions, driving him to give an answer by himself. God has checked the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) from doing so. This is its primary intent which connects the preceding and following parts of the *āyah*. That of Ibn 'Abbās is the secondary one according to which interrelation between the different parts is unnecessary.

---

[1] **For full elucidation of the subject, please refer to the original work, vol. 1, pp. 191-95.**

Our own explanation brings in the principles of coordination. Keeping these in view we might say that the collection of different parts of revelation in the Prophet's mind provides an analogy for assembling scattered particles of dead bodies to resuscitate them on the Doomsday. If one is possible despite all hardships, the other too is perfectly possible.

Relevance of this *Ḥadīth* to the Heading

The *ḥadīth* has a vital relation with the heading. It is God Himself and not a human being who is responsible for the collection, recitation and exposition of the meaning and purpose of the Qur'ān. This shows the great importance of the revelation because nothing can be more reliable and authoritative than it.

5. We have been told by 'Abdān who said he was told by 'Abd Allāh bin Mubārak on the authority of Yūnus *via* Zuhrī ; through another transmissional chain : Bishr bin Muḥammad told us he was told by 'Abd Allāh bin Mubārak who was informed by Yūnus and Ma'mar, the latter with different wording, from Zuhrī : I was told by 'Ubayd Allāh bin 'Abd Allāh that he heard.

✠ Ibn 'Abbās (*raḍiallāho 'anho*) say:

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) surpassed all others in charity and was at the zenith of his munificence during the month of Ramaḍān when Jibra'īl used to meet him. And Jibra'īl used to meet him every night during Ramaḍān, reciting the Qur'ān with him. In short, the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) was even more generous than the swift breeze in performing charitable acts.

5 حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدَانُ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ
قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا يُونُسُ عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ ح وَحَدَّثَنَا
بِشْرُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ قَالَ
أَخْبَرَنَا يُونُسُ وَمَعْمَرٌ نَحْوَهُ قَالَ عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ
أَخْبَرَنِي عُبَيْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ
رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا قَالَ كَانَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَجْوَدَ النَّاسِ وَكَانَ أَجْوَدُ مَا يَكُونُ
فِي رَمَضَانَ حِينَ يَلْقَاهُ جِبْرِيلُ وَكَانَ يَلْقَاهُ
فِي كُلِّ لَيْلَةٍ مِنْ رَمَضَانَ فَيُدَارِسُهُ الْقُرْآنَ
فَلَرَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَجْوَدُ
بِالْخَيْرِ مِنَ الرِّيحِ الْمُرْسَلَةِ ؞

Authority for the Above *Ḥadīth*

As stated by 'Aynī, 'Abdān was the plural of 'Abd occurring both in his actual name 'Abd al-Raḥmān and patronym 'Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān.[1]

كَانَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَجْوَدَ النَّاسِ

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) excelled others in generosity. This is a quality springing from largeness of heart and not wealth and riches. Qārūn (Croesus) was proverbially rich but not generous. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was not affluent, but so far as his innate charitable disposition is concerned, he was munificence personified.

Distinction between Charity and Benificence

Charity means giving away of wealth. Imām Rāghib has defined beneficence as bestowing upon a person what is suitable for him. Hence beneficence has a wider import, covering a large field, including guidance, spiritual benefits, learning and knowledge. It is not confined to mere material commodities nor to their indiscriminate distribution. Clothing the naked and feeding the starving is not beneficence. Taken in this sense the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was evidently the most generous person. Who could provide more guidance and spiritual benefits to men than he? He would give to each person what was fit for him. He has not been called "the most charitable" since charity depends upon wealth, and the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was not wealthy. He possessed attributes of nobility far in excess of all others, although it is possible that because of certain external factors some of his qualities were not brought into full play. The Prophet's magnamimity was so extraordinary that he never hoarded anything.

---

[1] For further light on Authority and the device called *taḥwil* (curtailing narrations) see the original work, vol. I, page 200.

Some Incidents showing the Prophet's Generosity

One day, as soon as the late afternoon prayer was over, the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عیه وسلم) went straight home passing through a group of men and brought a piece of gold saying that a thing which should have been distributed among the people had remained in his house, said it was not proper that such a thing should remain in a prophet's house.

On another occasion, a woman brought a sarong to be presented to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه سلم) which he accepted with great pleasure. When he had worn it, a Companion touched it and said it was very fine. It seemd from his words that he wished to have it. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) immediately went home, put on his old sarong, and, packing the other, gave it to the Companion. Those present maligned the man for taking away the sarong which the woman had brought out of great regard and respect for the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) who graciously accepted it. He replied, "I have taken it be cause it has touched the sacred body of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and I wish to keep such a piece of cloth as has touched the Prophet's holy body for my shroud."

Once a sum of one hundred thousand *dirhams* came from Baḥrayn. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) directed the amount to be placed in a corner of the mosque and after the prayers, started dsitributing the amount. Someone asked him as to why he did not keep anything for paying off his debt. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) replied, "Why did you not remind me of that before?"

On the occasion of the Battle of Ḥunayn, some nomad Arabs came up and insolently besought something from the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) saying they were asking for this out of Allāh's belongings and not his own. Some words were even more rough. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) did not resent what they said and gave them a helping hand. On this occasion he went on receding due to the on rush of men till he got entangled in an acacia tree, his sheet being caught in the thorns. Seeing this he said if he had as many heads of cattle as the thorny trees in that valley, he would have divided them among all. Even if anyone did not make a formal request but the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) somehow came to know his need, he would fulfil it. And if he was not in a position to do so he would acquire a loan for him; failing even that, he would draw the attention of some Companion to fulfil the need of the person.

Prophet's Beneficence : Reflection of Divine Beneficence

The word *ajwad* (Most generous) has been especially used for the Prophet as *jūd* (or generosity) indicates a higher degree of munificence, than charity which simply means giving something to another with some personal interest e.g., good will, renown and so on. In generosity, however, one is absolutely indifferent to all such motives. This is why the Attribute of God is the *jawwād* (generous) and not Charitable. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) has said :

Imbue yourself with Divine attributes.

تَخَلَّقُوْا بِأَخْلَاقِ اللّٰهِ ؞

The highest predestle of virtue in this respect could only by achieved by the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) because his attributes and states were dependent on the attributes of God, and being a reflection of Divine Attributes in the universe, his rank is the highest. The rank of other prophets is next to his. Likewise those who try to cultivate these virtues hold a special hierarchical position. All bounties of the world are granted by God, as mentioned in *Sūrah al-Naḥl*:

And whatever of comfort ye enjoy, it is from Allāh. (Qur'ān, 16:53)

وَمَا بِكُمْ مِّنْ نِّعْمَةٍ فَمِنَ اللّٰهِ ۔ النحل آیة ٥٣

And it is impossible to recount the bounties that have been bestowed on man in the whole universe :

...and if ye would count the bounty of Allāh, ye cannot reckon it. (Qur'ān, 14:34)

وَإِنْ تَعُدُّوْا نِعْمَتَ اللّٰهِ لَا تُحْصُوْهَا ۔ ابراہیم ٣٤

And then the greatest boon of all was granted to human beings which is beyond comparison—the Holy Qur'ān—through the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and its understanding and recitation were also bestowed on him. As God says:

And in truth We have made the Qur'ān easy to remember; but is there any that remembereth? (Qur'ān, 54:22)

وَلَقَدْ يَسَّرْنَا الْقُرْاٰنَ لِلذِّكْرِ فَهَلْ مِنْ مُّدَّكِرٍ ۝ القمر آیة ٢٢

It was not within our power even to hear a speech of such excellence. It is because of God's Beneficence alone that we recite His Speech which is His and His alone and are able to understand its implications and purport. He has made us the Khayr al-Umam (the best of the communities) because of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and the Divine Message which he brought. This bounty of the Qur'ān whose wonders will never end till the Doomsday, commenced, according to the *Aḥādīth*, in the month of Ramaḍān; it was revealed during this one month from the Abode of Majesty (*Bayt al-'Izzah*) to the terrestrial firmament. Thereafter it was sent down intermittently, and started descending into this world also in the same month. According to some *Aḥādīth*, the date when the Qur'ān started descending was the 24th and, according to others, the 27th of Ramaḍān. But these reports do not fulfil the conditions laid down by Imām Bukhārī ; therefore he does not include them and merely makes a reference to them. This is why there is a special relation between the Qur'ān and the month of Ramaḍān. The Qur'ān says :

The month of Ramaḍān in which was revealed the Qur'ān. (Qur'ān, 2:185)

شَهْرُ رَمَضَانَ الَّذِيْٓ اُنْزِلَ فِيْهِ الْقُرْاٰنُ ۔ بقرہ ١٨٥

Other blessings too besides this one were poured forth during this auspicious month. Although the Beneficence of God is always there yet in the month of Ramaḍān its radiance increases all the more. If God the Almighty is so Beneficent then the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) must needs be so.

The Holy Prophet's beneficence وَكَانَ أَجْوَدُ مَا يَكُونُ فِي رَمَضَانَ حِينَ يَلْقَاهُ جِبْرِيلُ reached the climax during the Ramaḍān when he was visited by the Angel Jibra'īl. This was because the month of Ramaḍān is the most auspicious of all the months; the visitor was no other than the most exalted of the Angels; the Book brought by the arch-angel was the greatest of all sacred books, and the recipient thereof was the noblest of the creatures, the chief of the Prophets (صلى الله عليه وسلم). However, when all these blissful and sublime things gathered together, how could it be possible that the ocean of the Prophet's beneficence should not surge up and the fountain of his profound knowledge should not come into play?

Exaltation of Places and Times:

It is a moot point if any place or time possesses some distinction because of something inherent in it, that is, it is natural to it or because all places and times are, in fact, the same but gain a special distinction because of some external factors or momentous events. Most scholastics believe that intrinsically all places and times are equal, and no particular period or space has precedence over others. Later on, however, a particular period or place may acquire precedence.

Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī, Ibn al-Qayyim and other such scholars hold that a particular period or place must be possessing congenitally some property which stands established in God's primeval eternal knowledge because of which momentous matters and events take place in them. They also believe that with such occurrences the inherent worthiness and merit of a particular period or place are enhanced. Take for example, the Yaum-i-'Āshūrah (the 10th of Muḥarram) which according to the scholastics (*Mutakallimeen*) has no precedence over the other days; in fact, it has featured as the day on which God conferred great favours on His chosen servants, e.g., emancipating the Prophet Nūḥ (عليه السلام) from the persecution of his people by causing the Deluge ; saving Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) from fire ; drowning of Pharaoh and liberating Mūsā (عليه السلام) and his folk, and so on. The occurrence of these incidents has conferred exaltation on it. Other scholars (*Muḥaqqiqīn*) however hold that since such a day had a special inherent virtue, all these great events occurred therein because of which it became all the more exalted. Take, for instance, the Laylat al-Qadr. The scholastics (*Mutakallimeen*) say that it has no distinction or precedence over other nights, but since the Qur'ān and other Scriptures descended on this night, it has acquired augustnesst Scholars hold that since it possessed an inherent worthiness or estimable quality, the Revelation descended on it. Similar is the case with the place which contains the *Bayt Allāh* (House of God or Ka'bah). The scholastics (*Mutakallimeen*) say that it had no distinction, merit or precedence in itself. Since the practice of performing the Hajj commenced there and pious people go and circumambulate the sanctuary, it has acquired a distinctive virtue and sanctity. The scholars (*Muḥaqqiqīn*) say that the place did possess some special virtue bacause of which the Hajj ritual was ordained. Similarly there are so many instances which may be cited.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Qayyim, in his *Zād al-Ma'ād* has established the viewpoint of the scholars (*Muḥaqqiqīn*) at the very outset in great detail with arguments and proofs against the stance of the scholastics (*Mutakallimeen*) embodied in the dictum : "هو اعظم جناية جناها المتكلمون على الشريعة" "It is the greatest offence committed by the scholastics against the *Sharī'ah.*"

This is the stand taken by later scholars like Shāh Walī Allāh al-Dihlawī and Muḥammad Qāsim al-Nānawtawī, which by the Grace of God, is the correct one for God Himself says :

Thy Lord bringeth to pass what He willeth and chooseth. (Qur'ān, 28:68) وَرَبُّكَ يَخْلُقُ مَا يَشَآءُ وَيَخْتَارُ

God is All-Wise, and Wisdom means "وضع الشيى على محله" placing a thing in the right place. Hence whatever place God chooses for a great purpose must be possessing some innate special quality beforehand which other places do not; otherwise how would His Wisdom be demonstrated?[1]

Take this by way of example; the rose water does not acquire a speciality because it smells or is contained in a phial but it possesses by nature a special quality of its own; this is why it is preserved in a phial while the urine is thrown away.

فَيُدَارِسُهُ الْقُرْاٰنَ That is, the angel Jibra'īl used to recite the Qur'ān with the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) for *mudārasat* is an infinitive on the pattern of *mufa'alah* applying to both the sides. Here it means reciting together.

اَجْوَدُ النَّاسِ مِنَ الرِّيْحِ الْمُرْسَلَةِ In matters of generosity, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was quicker than even the fleeting wind.

Rīḥ-i mursalah here means the same as that in the following verse:

(It is) He Who sendeth the winds as heralds of His mercy ! (Qur'ān, 27:63)

وَمَنْ يُّرْسِلُ الرِّيٰحَ بُشْرًا بَيْنَ
يَدَیْ رَحْمَتِهٖ - (النمل، آیۃ ٦٣)

The benefits of the wind are general. It reaches every nook and corner, and moves fast. So the simile here is with respect to generality, inclusiveness and rapidity.

Relevance of the *ḥadīth* to the Book of *Waḥī*

The *ḥadīth* has been discussed in the Book of Revelation by Imām Bukhārī and its relevance to it is self-evident as it discusses the superlative qualities and faculties of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), his noble conduct and high attributes which constitute the pre-requisites to *waḥī*. One of these is the virtue of beneficence. Time and place are not specified for ordinary things which clearly shows the infallibility and majesty of *waḥī* at every step. The recitation together of the Qur'ān by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسم) and Angel Jibra'īl is in the nature of an annual commemoration. This also shows that the descent of *waḥī* commenced in the month of Ramaḍān. This highlights all the more the sublimity and greatness of *waḥī*.

The above citation proves that generosity is a thing of excellence. Its magnitude increases particularly during the month of Holy Ramḍān It further testifies the frequent recitation of the Qur'ān in the month of Ramḍān. Besides, it upholds the recitation of other religious books. It further reveals that recitation of the Qur'ān is better than anyother kind of recitation. This also signifies the importance of the company of Pious person.

---

[1] For a detailed discussion on the subject, the *Zād al-Ma'ād* may be consulted.

6. It is related by Abū al-Yamān Ḥakam bin Nāfi' who said he was told by Shu'ayb on the authority of Zuhri on the authority of 'Ubayd Allāh bin 'Abd Allāh bin 'Utbah bin Mas'ūd that Ibn 'Abbās (*raḍiallāho 'anho*) told him that.

✱ Abū Sufyān bin Ḥarb narrated to him as follows :

Heraclius, the Emperor of the Byzantine, sent for him along with other riders of the Quraysh who happened to be in Syria, and were transacting business there. This was the time when a term (of truce) had been granted by the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) to Abū Sufyān and the infidels of Quraysh. So Abū Sufyān and his companions went to him (Heraclius) while he and his men were at Aelya.[1] Heraclius had them called to his court where his senior Byzantine dignitaries were sitting around him. Then he called them (near) and sent for an interpreter. The latter said (translating Heraclius's question) : "Who amongst you is closely related to the man who claims to be a Prophet"? Abū Sufyān replied, I am the most closely related to him (in this group).

Heraclius thereupon said, "Bring him (Abū Sufyān) close to me and keep his companions standing close behind him." Then Heraclius asked the interpreter to tell those people that he wished to ask some questions from this man (Abū Sufyān) ; if he lies, then let me know. Abū Sufyān said, "by God, had I not fought shy of my companions calling me a liar, I would not have desisted from telling lies about the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). The first question he put to me was "How does his family stand among you?" I replied, "His family commands a high status among us." Then he asked, "Did anyone else amongst you make such a claim (to Prophethood) before this?" I replied, "No." He said, "Has there been a king among his ancestors?" I replied, 'No.' He then asked : "Do nobles follow him or the poor?" I replied, "It is the poor." He asked, "Is the number of his followers rising or declining (day by day)?" I replied, "It is rising." He then asked, "Does anybody amongst those who embrace his religion became displeased and renounce the religion." I replied, 'No.' Heraclius then asked, "Have you ever accused him of telling lies before his claim (to prophethood)?" I again replied, No. Heraclius then asked, "Does he (ever) break his promises?" I said, "No; we have now a truce with him but do not know what he would do during the period." Abū Sufyān could not find any opportunity to put in anything else.

Heraclius went on to ask," Have you ever fought with him?" I replied, Yes. "What was the outcome of the battle?" I replied, "The fight between him and us is like the

6 حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْيَمَانِ الْحَكَمُ بْنُ نَافِعٍ
قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا شُعَيْبٌ عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنِي
عُبَيْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ عُتْبَةَ بْنِ مَسْعُودٍ
أَنَّ عَبْدَ اللّٰهِ بْنَ عَبَّاسٍ أَخْبَرَهُ أَنَّ أَبَا سُفْيَانَ بْنَ
حَرْبٍ أَخْبَرَهُ أَنَّ هِرَقْلَ أَرْسَلَ إِلَيْهِ فِي رَكْبٍ مِّنْ
قُرَيْشٍ وَكَانُوا تُجَّارًا بِالشَّامِ فِي الْمُدَّةِ الَّتِي كَانَ
رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مَادَّ فِيهَا أَبَا سُفْيَانَ
وَكُفَّارَ قُرَيْشٍ فَأَتَوْهُ وَهُمْ بِإِيلِيَاءَ فَدَعَاهُمْ فِي
مَجْلِسِهِ وَحَوْلَهُ عُظَمَاءُ الرُّومِ ثُمَّ دَعَاهُمْ وَدَعَا
بِتَرْجُمَانِهِ فَقَالَ أَيُّكُمْ أَقْرَبُ نَسَبًا بِهٰذَا الرَّجُلِ الَّذِي
يَزْعُمُ أَنَّهُ نَبِيٌّ قَالَ أَبُو سُفْيَانَ فَقُلْتُ أَنَا أَقْرَبُهُمْ
نَسَبًا فَقَالَ أَدْنُوهُ مِنِّي وَقَرِّبُوا أَصْحَابَهُ فَاجْعَلُوهُمْ
عِنْدَ ظَهْرِهِ ثُمَّ قَالَ لِتَرْجُمَانِهِ قُلْ لَّهُمْ إِنِّي
سَائِلٌ هٰذَا عَنْ هٰذَا الرَّجُلِ فَإِنْ كَذَبَنِي
فَكَذِّبُوهُ فَوَاللّٰهِ لَوْلَا الْحَيَاءُ مِنْ أَنْ يَّأْثِرُوا
عَلَيَّ كَذِبًا لَكَذَبْتُ عَنْهُ ثُمَّ كَانَ أَوَّلَ مَا سَأَلَنِي
عَنْهُ أَنْ قَالَ كَيْفَ نَسَبُهُ فِيكُمْ قُلْتُ هُوَ فِينَا
ذُو نَسَبٍ قَالَ فَهَلْ قَالَ هٰذَا الْقَوْلَ مِنْكُمْ
أَحَدٌ قَطُّ قَبْلَهُ قُلْتُ لَا قَالَ فَهَلْ كَانَ مِنْ
آبَائِهِ مِنْ مَّلِكٍ قُلْتُ لَا قَالَ فَأَشْرَافُ النَّاسِ يَتَّبِعُونَهُ
أَمْ ضُعَفَاؤُهُمْ فَقُلْتُ بَلْ ضُعَفَاؤُهُمْ قَالَ أَيَزِيدُونَ
أَمْ يَنْقُصُونَ قُلْتُ بَلْ يَزِيدُونَ قَالَ فَهَلْ
يَرْتَدُّ أَحَدٌ مِّنْهُمْ سَخْطَةً لِّدِينِهِ بَعْدَ أَنْ
يَّدْخُلَ فِيهِ قُلْتُ لَا قَالَ فَهَلْ كُنْتُمْ تَتَّهِمُونَهُ
بِالْكَذِبِ قَبْلَ أَنْ يَّقُولَ مَا قَالَ قُلْتُ لَا قَالَ
فَهَلْ يَغْدِرُ قُلْتُ لَا وَنَحْنُ مِنْهُ فِي مُدَّةٍ لَا نَدْرِي
مَا هُوَ فَاعِلٌ فِيهَا قَالَ وَلَمْ تُمْكِنِّي كَلِمَةٌ أُدْخِلُ
فِيهَا شَيْئًا غَيْرُ هٰذِهِ الْكَلِمَةِ قَالَ فَهَلْ قَاتَلْتُمُوهُ
قُلْتُ نَعَمْ قَالَ فَكَيْفَ كَانَ قِتَالُكُمْ إِيَّاهُ قُلْتُ
الْحَرْبُ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَهُ سِجَالٌ يَنَالُ مِنَّا وَنَنَالُ
مِنْهُ قَالَ مَاذَا يَأْمُرُكُمْ قُلْتُ يَقُولُ اعْبُدُوا اللّٰهَ

buckets (of a Persian wheel); sometimes he inflicts a loss and sometimes we." Heraclius then asked, "What does he ask you to do?" I replied: "He tells us to worship Allāh and Allāh alone and not to join anyone with Him; to abjure all (polytheistic) practices of our ancestors. He commands us to pray, to speak truth, to abstain (from fornication) and to maintain good terms with relatives."

Heraclius then asked the interpreter to tell me (Abū Sufyān) the following: "I asked you about his lineage and you said he had a high lineage and Messengers are always commissioned from high families. And I asked you, Did anyone else make such a claim ere this and you said 'No.' What I meant was that if anyone had done so, I would have said he was following his example. I asked you whether any of his ancestors had been a king and you answered No. What I meant was that if anyone of his ancestors had been a king, I would have thought he wanted to recover his ancestral kingdom (by pretending to be a prophet). I asked you whether you had ever found him telling a lie and you replied in the negative. So I concluded that it was not possible that when he avoided foisting lies upon people, he would foist lies on God. I asked you whether it was the rich or the poor that followed him. You said it was the poor. In fact, all the Apostles have been often followed by the poor. I asked you whether there was a rise or fall in the number of his followers, to which you said his followers were multiplying. This is always the case with Faith till it reaches fulfilment. I further enquired from you whether there was anyone who, after going over to his fold, became displeased and discorded his religion. Your reply was in the negative; in fact this is (the sign of) true faith; when its joy enters the heart it never departs from it. I asked you if he ever resorted to treachery, and you said he did not; that is how the Apostles are; they never break their word. Then I asked you what does he command you to do? You replied that he ordered you to worship Allāh and Allāh alone, not to make anyone a partner with Him. He forbids you idol-worship, enjoins upon you prayers, trust and chastity. If what you say is true, he will soon be master of this place under my feet, i.e., Byzantine. I knew the Apostle would come but I did not know he would be from amongst you. If I knew I could reach him, I would certainly try to meet him; had I been with him (in Madīnah) I would have washed his feet."

Heraclius then asked for the letter addressed by the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) which he had sent through Diḥyah al-Kalbī to the Governor of Buṣrā, (6 A.H.), who had it sent to Heraclius. The latter read it. Its contents were as follows:—

وَحْدَهٗ وَلَا تُشْرِكُوْا بِهٖ شَيْئًا وَّاتْرُكُوْا مَا يَقُوْلُ
اٰبَاۗؤُكُمْ وَيَاْمُرُنَا بِالصَّلٰوةِ وَالصِّدْقِ وَالْعَفَا
وَالصِّلَةِ فَقَالَ لِلتَّرْجُمَانِ قُلْ لَهٗ سَاَلْتُكَ عَنْ
نَسَبِهٖ فَذَكَرْتَ اَنَّهٗ فِيْكُمْ ذُوْ نَسَبٍ فَكَذٰلِكَ
الرُّسُلُ تُبْعَثُ فِيْ نَسَبِ قَوْمِهَا وَسَاَلْتُكَ هَلْ
قَالَ اَحَدٌ مِّنْكُمْ هٰذَا الْقَوْلَ فَذَكَرْتَ اَنْ لَّا
قُلْتُ لَوْ كَانَ اَحَدٌ قَالَ هٰذَا الْقَوْلَ قَبْلَهٗ لَقُلْتُ
رَجُلٌ يَّاْتَسِيْ بِقَوْلٍ قِيْلَ قَبْلَهٗ وَسَاَلْتُكَ هَلْ
كَانَ مِنْ اٰبَاۗئِهٖ مِنْ مَّلِكٍ فَذَكَرْتَ اَنْ لَّا قُلْتُ
فَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ اٰبَاۗئِهٖ مِنْ مَّلِكٍ قُلْتُ رَجُلٌ يَّطْلُبُ
مُلْكَ اَبِيْهِ وَسَاَلْتُكَ هَلْ كُنْتُمْ تَتَّهِمُوْنَهٗ بِالْكَذِبِ
قَبْلَ اَنْ يَّقُوْلَ مَا قَالَ فَذَكَرْتَ اَنْ لَّا فَقَدْ
اَعْرِفُ اَنَّهٗ لَمْ يَكُنْ لِيَذَرَ الْكَذِبَ عَلَى النَّاسِ
وَيَكْذِبَ عَلَى اللّٰهِ وَسَاَلْتُكَ اَشْرَافُ النَّاسِ
اتَّبَعُوْهُ اَمْ ضُعَفَاۗؤُهُمْ فَذَكَرْتَ اَنَّ ضُعَفَاۗءَهُمُ
اتَّبَعُوْهُ وَهُمْ اَتْبَاعُ الرُّسُلِ وَسَاَلْتُكَ اَيَزِيْدُوْنَ
اَمْ يَنْقُصُوْنَ فَذَكَرْتَ اَنَّهُمْ يَزِيْدُوْنَ وَكَذٰلِكَ
اَمْرُ الْاِيْمَانِ حَتّٰى يَتِمَّ وَسَاَلْتُكَ اَيَرْتَدُّ اَحَدٌ
سَخْطَةً لِّدِيْنِهٖ بَعْدَ اَنْ يَّدْخُلَ فِيْهِ فَذَكَرْتَ
اَنْ لَّا وَكَذٰلِكَ الْاِيْمَانُ حِيْنَ تُخَالِطُ بَشَاشَتُهُ
الْقُلُوْبَ وَسَاَلْتُكَ هَلْ يَغْدِرُ فَذَكَرْتَ اَنْ لَّا
وَكَذٰلِكَ الرُّسُلُ لَا تَغْدِرُ وَسَاَلْتُكَ بِمَا يَاْمُرُكُمْ
فَذَكَرْتَ اَنَّهٗ يَاْمُرُكُمْ اَنْ تَعْبُدُوا اللّٰهَ وَلَا تُشْرِكُوْا بِهٖ
شَيْئًا وَّيَنْهٰكُمْ عَنْ عِبَادَةِ الْاَوْثَانِ وَيَاْمُرُكُمْ
بِالصَّلٰوةِ وَالصِّدْقِ وَالْعَفَافِ فَاِنْ كَانَ مَا
تَقُوْلُ حَقًّا فَسَيَمْلِكُ مَوْضِعَ قَدَمَيَّ هَاتَيْنِ وَقَدْ
كُنْتُ اَعْلَمُ اَنَّهٗ خَارِجٌ وَّلَمْ اَكُنْ اَظُنُّ اَنَّهٗ
مِنْكُمْ فَلَوْ اَنِّيْ اَعْلَمُ اَنِّيْ اَخْلُصُ اِلَيْهِ لَتَجَشَّمْتُ
لِقَاۗءَهٗ وَلَوْ كُنْتُ عِنْدَهٗ لَغَسَلْتُ عَنْ قَدَمَيْهِ ثُمَّ
دَعَا بِكِتَابِ رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
الَّذِيْ بَعَثَ بِهٖ مَعَ دِحْيَةَ الْكَلْبِيِّ اِلٰى عَظِيْمِ

"In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful. Be it known to Hiraql, ruler of Byzantine, from Muḥammad, the servant of Allāh and His Apostle. Peace be upon him who follows the straight path. And thereafter, I invite you to accept the creed of Islam. There is no God save Allāh and Muḥammad is His Apostle. Should you become a Muslim you would be safe, and Allāh will double your reward, but if you do not accept this call, the sin of your people would also be upon you."

And the missive contained this *āyah* also :—

O people of the Book! Come to an agreement between us and you: that we shall worship none but Allāh and that we shall ascribe no partner unto Him, and that none of us shall take others for lords beside Allāh. And if they turn away, then say: Bear witness that we are they who have surrendered (unto Him).[2]

Abū Sufyān added; "When Heraclius had said what he wanted to say and read the letter, there arose a tumult in the Royal Court and lot of hue and cry. We were thereupon made to quit the Court. When we were sent out I said to my companions Lo! the son of Abī Kabshah[3] has attained a very high status: even the King of Banū al-Aṣfar (Byzantineans) is afraid of him. Since that day I had the full conviction that the Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) would ultimately have the upper hand, till at last I embraced Islam."

Zuhrī adds: "Ibn Nāṭūr, the governor of Aelya, a courtier of Heraclius, and the arch-bishop of Shām, stated that when Heraclius came to Aelya,[4] he woke up rather gloomy one morning. Some of his companions asked him the reason why he looked pulled down. Ibn Nāṭūr said that Heraclius was an astrologer well-versed in the science of the stars. When people asked him why he was so down-cast, he said: When I gazed at the stars (last night), it seemed as if the king of those who practise circumcision had become dominant. Who are those that practise circumcision in the present time? His companions replied: None except the Jews; be not afraid of them and write to (the governors of) places under your control to kill all the Jews living therein.

While they were thus conversing, a man was brought before Heraclius who had been sent by Ḥārith bin Abī Shimr, King of Ghassān. He talked about the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). When Heraclius had heard (all that he) had to say, he asked his attendants to see whether the man was circumcised. They examined him and told Heraclius that he was circumcised. Heraclius enquired from him whether the Arabs practised circumcision. He replied in the affirmative.

بُصْرٰى فَدَفَعَهُ عَظِيمُ بُصْرٰى إِلٰى هِرَقْلَ فَقَرَأَهُ فَإِذَا فِيهِ بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيمِ مِنْ مُحَمَّدٍ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ وَرَسُولِهِ إِلٰى هِرَقْلَ عَظِيمِ الرُّومِ سَلَامٌ عَلٰى مَنِ اتَّبَعَ الْهُدٰى أَمَّا بَعْدُ فَإِنِّي أَدْعُوكَ بِدِعَايَةِ الْإِسْلَامِ أَسْلِمْ تَسْلَمْ يُؤْتِكَ اللّٰهُ أَجْرَكَ مَرَّتَيْنِ فَإِنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ فَإِنَّ عَلَيْكَ إِثْمَ الْأَرِيسِيِّينَ وَيٰأَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلٰى كَلِمَةٍ سَوَآءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَنْ لَا نَعْبُدَ إِلَّا اللّٰهَ وَلَا نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِّنْ دُونِ اللّٰهِ فَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَقُولُوا اشْهَدُوا بِأَنَّا مُسْلِمُونَ ۝ قَالَ أَبُو سُفْيَانَ فَلَمَّا قَالَ مَا قَالَ وَفَرَغَ مِنْ قِرَآءَةِ الْكِتَابِ كَثُرَ عِنْدَهُ الصَّخَبُ وَارْتَفَعَتِ الْأَصْوَاتُ وَأُخْرِجْنَا فَقُلْتُ لِأَصْحَابِي حِينَ أُخْرِجْنَا لَقَدْ أَمِرَ أَمْرُ ابْنِ أَبِي كَبْشَةَ إِنَّهُ يَخَافُهُ مَلِكُ بَنِي الْأَصْفَرِ فَمَا زِلْتُ مُوقِنًا أَنَّهُ سَيَظْهَرُ حَتّٰى أَدْخَلَ اللّٰهُ عَلَيَّ الْإِسْلَامَ وَكَانَ ابْنُ النَّاطُورِ صَاحِبُ إِيلِيَاءَ وَهِرَقْلَ سُقُفًّا عَلٰى نَصَارٰى الشَّامِ يُحَدِّثُ أَنَّ هِرَقْلَ حِينَ قَدِمَ إِيلِيَاءَ أَصْبَحَ يَوْمًا خَبِيثَ النَّفْسِ فَقَالَ بَعْضُ بَطَارِقَتِهِ قَدِ اسْتَنْكَرْنَا هَيْئَتَكَ قَالَ ابْنُ النَّاطُورِ وَكَانَ هِرَقْلُ حَزَّآءً يَنْظُرُ فِي النُّجُومِ فَقَالَ لَهُمْ حِينَ سَأَلُوهُ إِنِّي رَأَيْتُ اللَّيْلَةَ حِينَ نَظَرْتُ فِي النُّجُومِ مَلِكَ الْخِتَانِ قَدْ ظَهَرَ فَمَنْ يَخْتَتِنُ مِنْ هٰذِهِ الْأُمَّةِ قَالُوا لَيْسَ يَخْتَتِنُ إِلَّا الْيَهُودُ فَلَا يُهِمَّنَّكَ شَأْنُهُمْ وَاكْتُبْ إِلٰى مَدَآئِنِ مُلْكِكَ فَيَقْتُلُوا مَنْ فِيهِمْ مِّنَ الْيَهُودِ فَبَيْنَا هُمْ عَلٰى أَمْرِهِمْ أُتِيَ هِرَقْلُ بِرَجُلٍ أَرْسَلَ بِهِ مَلِكُ غَسَّانَ يُخْبِرُ عَنْ خَبَرِ رَسُولِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَلَمَّا اسْتَخْبَرَهُ هِرَقْلُ قَالَ اذْهَبُوا فَانْظُرُوا أَمُخْتَتِنٌ هُوَ أَمْ لَا فَنَظَرُوا إِلَيْهِ فَحَدَّثُوهُ أَنَّهُ مُخْتَتِنٌ وَسَأَلَهُ عَنِ الْعَرَبِ فَقَالَ هُمْ يَخْتَتِنُونَ فَقَالَ

Then Heraclius remarked that it was this very person (the Holy Prophet), sovereign of the Arabs, had appeared. He then wrote a letter to a friend of his in Byzantine (named Ḍaghāṭir) who was as learned as he was. Heraclius then himself went to Ḥoms. He had not left the city before he received the reply to his letter from his friend who agreed with him about the appearance of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) that is, he was a true Prophet. At last Heraclius invited the chiefs of Byzantium to assemble in his palace at Ḥoms. When they had come in, he commanded all the doors of the palace to be closed. Then he stood in a balcony and said, "O people of Byzantium! If you desire to prosper, be rightly guided and preserve your empire, then swear allegiance to this Prophet (of Arabia) (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*)."

On hearing Heraclius say this, the people rushed onager-like towards the gates of the palace but found them closed. When Heraclius saw their hatred for Islam, he lost all hope of their embracing the new faith. He commanded them to be brought back to him. When they came back he said, what he had said just then was to put their convictions to test. He had seen how staunch they were in their faith. Then all the nobles prostrated themselves before him, and became reconciled to him. This is the last we know about Heraclius.

Imām Bukhārī says: The *ḥadīth* has been narrated by Ṣaliḥ bin Kaysān, Yūnus and Ma'mar also (like Shu'ayb) on the authority of Zuhrī.[5]

هِرَقْلُ هٰذَا مَلِكُ هٰذِهِ الْأُمَّةِ قَدْ ظَهَرَ ثُمَّ
كَتَبَ هِرَقْلُ إِلٰى صَاحِبٍ لَهُ بِرُومِيَةَ وَكَانَ
نَظِيرَهُ فِي الْعِلْمِ وَسَارَ هِرَقْلُ إِلٰى حِمْصَ فَلَمْ
يَرِمْ حِمْصَ حَتّٰى أَتَاهُ كِتَابٌ مِنْ صَاحِبِهِ يُوَافِقُ
رَأْيَ هِرَقْلَ عَلٰى خُرُوجِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ وَأَنَّهُ نَبِيٌّ فَأَذِنَ هِرَقْلُ لِعُظَمَاءِ الرُّومِ
فِي دَسْكَرَةٍ لَهُ بِحِمْصَ ثُمَّ أَمَرَ بِأَبْوَابِهَا فَغُلِّقَتْ
ثُمَّ اطَّلَعَ فَقَالَ يَا مَعْشَرَ الرُّومِ هَلْ لَكُمْ فِي
الْفَلَاحِ وَالرُّشْدِ وَأَنْ يَثْبُتَ مُلْكُكُمْ فَتُبَايِعُوا
هٰذَا النَّبِيَّ فَحَاصُوا حَيْصَةَ حُمُرِ الْوَحْشِ إِلَى
الْأَبْوَابِ فَوَجَدُوهَا قَدْ غُلِّقَتْ فَلَمَّا رَأَى هِرَقْلُ
نَفْرَتَهُمْ وَأَيِسَ مِنَ الْإِيمَانِ قَالَ رُدُّوهُمْ عَلَيَّ
وَقَالَ إِنِّي قُلْتُ مَقَالَتِي آنِفًا أَخْتَبِرُ بِهَا شِدَّتَكُمْ
عَلٰى دِينِكُمْ فَقَدْ رَأَيْتُ فَسَجَدُوا لَهُ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ
فَكَانَ ذٰلِكَ آخِرَ شَأْنِ هِرَقْلَ قَالَ أَبُو عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ
رَوَاهُ صَالِحُ بْنُ كَيْسَانَ وَيُونُسُ وَمَعْمَرٌ عَنِ
الزُّهْرِيِّ ۔

Preliminary Discussion of the *Ḥadīth* Respecting Heraclius

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) sent two missives to Heraclius: one on the occasion in which Abū Sufyān figures and the other on the occasion of the Battle of Tabūk. These two are often mixed up. It is, therefore, proposed to describe them one by one.

When Heraclius had reached Jerusalem, he had, through his astrological study, discovered one thing before Diḥyah Kalbī reached him with the Prophet's missives: He had one night found by astronomical calculations that the time for domination of the circumcised ones had come and the downfall of his empire would take place at their hands. He was very downcast next morning and his face betrayed his anxiety. One of his close companions, on looking at him, asked why he was so depressed. He replied, "When I was gazing at the junction of the stars, the rise to power of those who practise circumcision was manifested. My empire will decline at their hands. Who are those that practise circumcision these days?" His advisers replied that only the Jews did so but it was absolutely beyond them to overturn his empire. Let an order be passed and each and every Jew in his realm would be slain. While this

---

[1] That is, Jerusalem. [2] The Qur'ān, 3:64. [3] A term used in a contemptuous sense, since Abū Kabshah was not the name of the father of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). [4] That is, the Byzantine Empire. [5] For the historical background of the Byzantine and Fars (Iran), the prediction about the fall of the former in the Qur'ān and other significant matters, vol. I (pages 208-211) of the original work may please be consulted.

confabulation was going on, Diḥyah Kalbī, travelling through the credentials given him by the ruler of Ghassān, arrived with the Prophet's missive. Heraclius guessed from a cursory perusal of the letter and inquiries from the messenger that this letter had come from a man of Arabia who claimed to be a prophet. Then he wanted to know whether the messenger was circumcised or not. He was told that he was. He was further told that all Arabs practised circumcision. After this, he got a search made if any caravan had come from Arabia so that he could obtain detailed information about the person sending the missive. It transpired that a caravan of Abū Sufyān had come thither. Heraclius called Abū Sufyān to his court. He asked him many questions. After hearing his answers, he commented upon them and proclaimed the veracity of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in strong words and expressed his great ardour for the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Then the letter was read out publicly. When the courtiers saw that he was inclined towards the new faith, they raised a big hue and cry. Abū Sufyān and his companions were dismissed. Abū Sufyān was also led to confess that Islam had gained great force, so far so that even the Byzantinian emperor who had laid low the pride of the Chosroe, felt afraid of him. He said: "The time is not far off when he (the Prophet) would be master of the land underneath my feet."

Rūm, which is today known as *Roma Magna* and is presently the capital of Italy, has been the centre of Christianity from the very beginning. There was a Christian archbishop in Rome named Ḍaghāṭir. He was very well versed in the Scriptures and was acknowledged as a scholar throughout the Christian world. Heraclius sent to him the Prophet's letter along with an account of his having seen it beforehand through astrological observation, saying this was the very person practising circumcision. It cannot be said with certainty who carried Heraclius's letter to Ḍaghāṭir. Heraclius started from Jerusalem and sojourned at Ḥomṣ when his statement reached the bishop at Rūm alongwith the Prophet's missive. He corroborated Heraclius, saying he too knew that the time of the last of prophets was near at hand; it seemed this was that very Prophet. But the archbishop did not proclaim his Muslimhood at that time. He only confirmed Heraclius's opinion. When the latter was still at Ḥomṣ, the archbishop also fell in with his views; he entertained the hope that it was possible his people would join Islam and acknowledge the apostleship of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), since this is what the most learned archbishop and the greatest king of the world were saying. Entertaining this hope, he sent for persons of high status. But since he knew the revulsion and pandemonium of the people on what he had said before, he adopted the device of closing all the exits after calling them into his palace and adressed the audience from a balcony so that if anyone suddenly determined to do him violence, he should not be able to reach him easily and people may not go out in excitement and start agitation. All their excitement should die out there. Having made these arrangements he had a look at the audience and addressed it in these words: "O people of Byzantine, herein lies your salvation and right guidance."

When they heard this speech of Heraclius, they began to say that this man wants to enslave us to Arabia. Finding them ill disposed, Heraclius thought that if he accepted the Apostleship of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he would lose his empire; his subjects would revolt against him. Hence he did not embrace Islam for the sake of his power and pelf and resorted to that very stratagem which has been mentioned in the *ḥadīth* so that all became reconciled to him. He did not embrace Islam but did not treat Prophet's letter with contempt as had been done by the Chosroe. On the other hand, he treated it reverently and got it wrapped in silken cover and deposited it with great care, saying as long as it would remain with them, it would spell good. It occurs in some reports that after Diḥyah reached with the missive, Heraclius asked him not to go back soon. He kept him as a guest for some days. One day he took him along to a room. In the *Musnad* of Aḥmad it has been reported that the total number of prophets is one hundred and twenty four thousand, of whom the number of Apostles is three hundred and thirteen. Therefore he had kept three hundred and thirteen pictures thereof in the room. Heraclius asked Diḥyah Kalbī: "Can you identify your Prophet among them?" Diḥyah says that he found one picture to be exactly like that of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and he told Heraclius so.

Second Invitation to Heraclius to Embrace Islam

There is some difference of opinion as to who was the emperor of the Byzantine empire at the time when the Byzantinians were utterly routed in the battle of Yarmūk during the reign of Caliph 'Umar, whether it was Heraclius or his son. But all are agreed upon the fact that during the Battle of Tabūk,[1] when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself led a force thirty thousand strong, the emperor of Byzantine was the self-same Heraclius. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) sent another letter to Heraclius inviting him to Islam. The messenger this time also was Diḥyah Kalbī. When the letter was handed over to Heraclius, he said: What can I do, because, as it is, my people would not agree to my command. There is a powerful archbishop in Rūm who is held in great respect by the Christians; take this letter to him." So Diḥyah went to the archbishop with the missive. This time, it is definite that the bearer of the letter was Diḥyah Kalbī himself. But it is not certain whether the archbishop of Rūm was Ḍaghāṭir or someone else. Whosoever he might have been, he testified that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was really the last Prophet and confessed his faith in Islam. He also said to Diḥyah Kalbī to convey his greetings to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and inform him that he had embraced his faith. He then took a bath, changed his clothes and proclaimed publicly: "Look, the last Prophet has come amongst us; acknowledge him as I do," and then recited the Muslim article of faith. But those present became so furious that they killed him there and then. Seeing all this, Diḥyah Kalbī left the place forthwith and related the whole matter to Heraclius. He said, "Do you see? If they meted out such a treatment to the archbishop who was universally respected, you can imagine how they would treat me." Thus he did not embrace Islam in the real sense, the lure for empire and power and pelf prevented him from doing so. Mere showing of ardour and preferring of truth means nothing. This is not real faith. It is something else, as will be discussed later. Hence when he sent a letter to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) on the occasion of the Battle of Tabūk saying, "Indeed I am a Muslim," the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: "كذب عدو الله انه علىٰ نصرانية او كما قال" "This enemy of God has told a lie. He is but a Christian," or whatever the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) may have said. It appears what Heraclius said was mere lip profession and did not import real allegiance and acknowledgement. Hence his being a nonbeliever is absolutely certain.

---

[1] This battle, one of the most memorable and decisive in the history of mankind, occurred on August 20, 636 A.D. The Byzantinian forces were led by Theodorus, the brother of Heraclius with 50,000 soldiers of the Byzantines arrayed against 25,000 Muslims. It is probably because the forces were led by Theodorus, who himself fell in the battle, that Mawlānā 'Uthmānī expresses his doubt about who was the emperor at the time. Actually Heraclius died in 641 A.D., after a 31-years reign, and was succeeded by Constantine III who in the same year gave way to Heraclius. *Ed.*

Brief History of Rum

The expression Rūm applies only to that region which is today known as *Roma Magna* and where the capital of Italy is situated. This too is known as Rūmīyah. But in earlier times it applied to the whole tract comprising Rūmīyah, Constantinople. Asia Minor and Greece because the seat of government happened to be Rūmīyah which, in fact, constituted Rūm proper, all the territories being subject to it. This is why it was called Rūm. Rūmīyah held central status in the beginning. Then mutual differences arose and another centre also sprang up. Thus the capital of Rūm in the times of Heraclius was Constantinople, Shām being under its sway. Ḥomṣ is the name of a big city of this very land on the way to Jerusalem.

Discussion of the *Ḥadīth*

أَبَا سُفْيَانَ بْنَ حَرْبٍ أَخْبَرَهُ

This was narrated by Abū Sufyān after he had become a Muslim, although the event had occurred during the Days of Ignorance.

أَنَا أَقْرَبُهُمْ نَسَبًا

This was said by Abū Sufyān since in the fourth generation the genealogical tree of Abū Sufyān joins that of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in 'Abd Manāf. His real name was Ṣakhr and his genealogical tree upto four generations was: Ṣakhr bin Ḥarb bin Umayyah bin 'Abd al-Shams bin 'Abd Manāf, while that of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was Muḥammad bin 'Abd Allāh bin 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib bin Hāshim bin 'Abd Manāf.

فَاجْعَلُوهُمْ عِنْدَ ظَهْرِهِ

"Such that being face to face should not hinder them from contradicting a statement."

فَوَاللهِ لَوْلَا الْحَيَاءُ مِنْ أَنْ يَأْثِرُوا عَلَيَّ كَذِبًا لَكَذَبْتُ عَنْهُ

Abū Sufyān swore that if he had not been deterred by shame that those people would broadcast his lie to others on returning he would have told gross lies. He said he trusted his men to this extent that none of them would contradict him but this lie would not end there and would be propagated in the whole community, which would undermine confidence in him. Another apprehension was that though for the time being Abū Sufyān might get away with the lie, it was possible that after the lie had recoiled back to Syria, the hub of the trade of the Quraysh, Heraclius might prohibit his entry into that country or have him arrested.

قُلْتُ هُوَ فِينَا ذُو نَسَبٍ

The first question which Heraclius put was about the Holy Prophet's lineage. The nunnation (*tanwīn*) denotes respect. The Holy Prophet's family was, indeed, the pick of the Quraysh, and Abū Sufyān had *per force* to admit his noble lineage, since by his own admission he was the closest relative of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) there. Had he derided his lineage, he would have derided his own too.

قَالَ فَهَلْ قَالَ هٰذَا الْقَوْلَ مِنْكُمْ أَحَدٌ قَطُّ قَبْلَهُ قُلْتُ لَا

Heraclius questioned Abū Sufyān whether such a message was given by any other person. Abū Sufyān probably denied it immediately so taht Heraclius should think he—the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)—had come out with a new message as if, God forbid, he was subject to hallucinations or magic as was the belief of the people of Makkah.

He immediately replied in the negative Heraclius's مِنْ اٰبَآئِهٖ مِنْ مَّلِكٍ question as to whether the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had a king amongst his ancestors, so that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) should be degraded in Heraclius's eyes and he might regard him as an ordinary person.

Here also Abū Sufyān's main purpose was derogatory, بَلْ ضُعَفَآؤُهُمْ for by saying that he was being followed mostly by the poor, he intended to point the insignificance of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), for his followers were but low people.

Replying to Heraclius's question whether anyone who سَخْطَةً لِدِيْنِهٖ embraced Islam later turned away, considering his religion abominable, Abū Sufyān said: "No." The word, *sakhṭah*, was employed by Heraclius very sagaciously, for it excluded those that tergiversated from Islam through venial motives or fear.

Heraclius asked whether the فَهَلْ تَتَّهِمُوْنَهٗ بِالْكَذِبِ قَبْلَ اَنْ يَّقُوْلَ مَا قَالَ قُلْتُ لَا Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had ever been accused of falsehood prior to his claim to prophethood. This was a very important question, as the unimpeachability of a claimant has considerable bearing on the truthfulness or validity of his message. During the beginning of his mission, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) climbed up Mt. *Ṣafā*. When the people gathered, he asked them if anyone had heard him lying in any matter. All present said they had not. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) thereupon said: "انی نذیر لکم بین یدی عذاب شدید" "Well, I am a warner to you before a severe chastisement." Abū Lahab had insulted the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) on this, which called forth the following verses: "تبت يدا ابی لهب" "The power of Abū Lahab will perish."

How would Abū Sufyān attribute falsehood to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) when he was unanimously called throughout Arabia the 'true and trusted?' Heraclius's query as to whether the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had been ever accused of falsehood before apostleship, bespeaks Heraclius's wisdom, for he does not ask whether the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) actually lied but whether falsehood was ever ascribed to him. The point is that if the accusation of lying is negative, it would *ipso facto* effectively negate lying itself.

Heraclius's question here relates to the breaking of فَهَلْ يَغْدِرُ قُلْتُ لَا promises and commitments, if any, by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Abū Sufyān here also replied in the negative. In fact the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was so firm in his commitments that once a pagan who was transacting some affair with him, requested him to wait at a place for a while and he would return soon. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) agreed. The pagan forgot all about it, and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) waited three days for him for such a trivial matter. The pagan passed that way by chance after that time and recollected his promise. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) only said this much that he had put him to great trouble.

Abū Sufyān goes on to say: "These days وَنَحْنُ مِنْهُ فِيْ مُدَّةٍ لَا نَدْرِيْ مَا هُوَ فَاعِلٌ فِيْهَا we have had a truce with him for some time; I cannot say what his attitude would be. Some narrations have this in addition: Abū Sufyān said this also that an ally of ours had committed excess on an ally of theirs. We too have supported our ally in this affair; God knows what he would do now. Upon this Heraclius said: "You break your pledges too often." After this Abū Sufyān said:

I could not get the opportunity to لَمْ تُمْكِنِّيْ كَلِمَةٌ اُدْخِلُ فِيْهَا شَيْئًا غَيْرُ هٰذِهِ الْكَلِمَةِ

add anything more to it except this. Abū Sufyān came out with the said remark but says he could not find out any other statement putting the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in a bad light, because the mode of expression is such that it relates to a future possibility which is but problematic. This shows that Abū Sufyān was delibertaely adopting this attitude although reposing full confidence in the sacred and immaculate personality of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he was absolutely certain that he would fulfill his compact.

Heraclius asks whether there was ever any war قَالَ فَهَلْ قَاتَلْتُمُوْهُ between both the sides. He knew that a Prophet never initiates war of his own. Only in the event of attack resistance becomes necessary. Abū Sufyān acknowledged that there had been battles between both. To Heraclius's question as to the outcome of these battles, he said:

The battles between us are like اَلْحَرْبُ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَهُمْ سِجَالٌ يَنَالُ مِنَّا وَنَنَالُ مِنْهُ competition in drawing buckets of water; sometimes we and at others the Muslims score success. Neither the Muslims nor their opponents had been continuously winning. Till that time three great battles had taken place between the Muslims and the Infidels—those at Badr, Uḥud, and Khandaq. At Badr the Muslims were successful, whereas at Uḥud the Infidels were apparently successful. Abū Sufyān is alluding to the battle of Uḥud, in which in fact the Muslims were successful. In the battle of Khandaq also the enemies of Islam suffered defeat. The word "سجال" "buckets" presents an image of the situation according to Abū Sufyān. The implication is that just as the bucket in a well sometimes falls into the hands of one party and at others those of the other so that the rival party has to wait to get hold of it, the same is the case with their wars. Some wells ply with the Persian wheel. The buckets full of water move upwards, while the empty ones go down. The situation of the war between the Muslims and the Infidels is just like that of buckets which do not remain at one place. Thus the balance of the battle tilts this way and that.

A Problem

There is a problem with regard to the construction of the expression "الحرب سجال". Whereas *sijāl* is plural, *ḥarb* (war) is singular. From the grammatical viewpoint it would not be correct to have the plural qualifications of a singular noun. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has countered this objection by saying that *ḥarb* is an indeterminate noun, while *sijāl* is a collective one; therefore *sijāl* serves as an accusative case. Ḥāfiẓ Badr al-Dīn 'Aynī disagrees with this opinion of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar. He says that *sijāl* is not a collective noun but plural. Its singular is *sajl*. It is preferable that it should be treated as a noun of action which has been brought in place of an accusative case for the sake of hyperbole. In this case, the purport would be that the mode of war is like *musājalat* (competition). This is why it has been elucidated by saying: He causes us loss and we cause him loss.

قَالَ مَاذَا يَأْمُرُكُمْ That is, what does the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) command you to do? Now that his personal traits and attributes have been ascertained, Abū Sufyān has been asked about his teachings.

قُلْتُ يَقُوْلُ اعْبُدُوا اللّٰهَ وَحْدَهٗ وَلَا تُشْرِكُوْا بِهٖ شَيْئًا وَّاتْرُكُوْا مَا يَقُوْلُ اٰبَاؤُكُمْ وَيَأْمُرُنَا بِالصَّلٰوةِ Abū Sufyān replies that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ordered people to worship one God only who shall not be set with any partners; to leave their ancestral ways, to offer prayers, to speak the truth, to be pious, and to render obligations to one's kindred. Abū Sufyān wished to incite the emperor of the Byzantines against Islam by his reply because Heraclius was a Christian and the Christians regard Christ as the Son of God. There was no room for such a belief in the Holy Prophet's teachings. Then Abū Sufyān says the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) enjoins prayers and truth upon people. In Bukhārī's narration, *ṣadaqah* and *zakāt* also occur, which shows that abbreviation has been resorted to here.

The Nature of *Shirk* and Shah Wali Allah

Shāh Walī Allāh's argument is that worship means total surrender of the self to God and this is of two kinds: (1) the formal, e.g., prostration, called the *sajdah*, since there is no greater form of humility possible with one's limbs, and (2) that which depends upon intention and faith and should well from the heart, that is there should be intent and determination, for the highest reverence of the Deity should be there in one's mind. When both the formal and subjective forms of utter humility combine, then alone can that extreme humility arise which is known as worship. If not, then the worship does not result in total surrender, since this is not the utmost humility called worship. Reverential and worshipful prostrations are alike in external appearance. Both spell the height of humility but there is great difference between them in motive and intent. It is not difficult to understand that when a person who regards another as a human being suffering from all the frailties of mortals and contingent beings and considers him neither higher in the hierarchy of phenomenal beings, nor endues him even with a single attribute, prostrates before him only because of a single propensity arising from ignorance, then no matter if it is out of reverence, as in the case of the subjects before kings or pupils before teachers, or for some other reason as in the case of the lover prostrating before the beloved, the extent of humility in the mind of one who resorts to this type of prostration and that when anyone prostrates before a person whom he considers above the defects and shortcomings of all types—a Creator and Puissant Being—or deems above the generality of created beings in any attribute, partaking with God in a special quality which is worthy of adoration, presents a world of difference as if one were like night and the other like day. The first type of humility would be far inferior to the other inasmuch as one who prostrates considers that he prostrates to one equal and alike to Allāh because of his special attributes. Hence he would make up his mind to express the appropriate type of humility before him. Thus adoration which is the highest pitch of humility would only arise when one offers a prostration to some being in the belief that he shares one of the special attributes of God. But if the prostration to anyone other than God is not with such belief then it would not be prostration for purpose of adoration. Hence it would be considered clear association of the adored with God as a partner, which is sheer idolatry.

Distinction between Reverential and Devotional Prostration: Not a Valid Measure for All Occasions

No doubt, this type of reverential prostration is also prohibited, tabu, Divine disobedience and an innovation in the Islamic *Sharī'ah*

---

[1] Here, after indicating the difference between prostration with intent to adore and that for reverence, both have been declared un-Islamic. For an interesting episode of the author's journey to the Ḥijāz, see detailed account in vol. I, pp. 216-18 of the original. *Ed.*

and a kind of *shirk* (joining others with God), since such adoration is obviously associating partners with God both in form and content and is akin to open *shirk*. But it should be borne in mind that the difference between reverential and worshipful prostration based on intent is sound only when the object to which prostration is made is neither regarded as infidelity nor polytheism and is not worshipped by the polytheists. Prostration before such an object like an idol or an image would be regarded obvious *shirk*, even though the prostrator might say that he did so only as an act of reverence and not adoration.

Varieties of *Shirk*

As to prostration before a god there are several aspects of *shirk*. Firstly, the belief that there exist two gods and creators as is the case of the Magians, who believe in Uhrmuzd and Ahriman. Secondly, he should consider someone participating in and possessing independently to any extent a special attribute of God, no matter whether it is so in point of authority or execution. That is he believes that though the supreme Being is only One, yet He has some angels and spirits under Him who have been entrusted with the affairs of the world, for instance, granting wealth, offspring and so on. Such powers and faculties have, in fact, been delegated by God but after this delegation of authority, they have full power to exercise it just like the deputies of a king and state functionaries. In fact all their powers are delegated by the ruler but thereafter they have complete authority to exercise them. They need not consult the king for their exercise. To clothe anyone with such powers is also a kind of *shirk*. The Infidels of Makkah entertained such beliefs about their idols and gods.

Credos of the Infidels in the Light of the Qur'an

Let us now see what the Qur'ān has to say about the creed of the Infidels. They also believed Allāh to be the First Cause in cardinal matters like creation. As the Qur'ān says:

If thou shouldst ask them: Who created the heavens and the earth? they would answer Allāh. (Qur'ān, 31:25)

وَلَئِنْ سَاَلْتَهُمْ مَّنْ خَلَقَ السَّمٰوٰتِ
وَالْاَرْضَ لَيَقُوْلُنَّ اللّٰهُ (لقمان آیت ۲۵)

Thus, while they regarded God as the Supreme Lord, they also believed (that he had) His deputies. Therefore they said:

We worship them only that they may bring us near unto Allāh. (Qur'ān, 39:3)

"مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ اِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُوْنَا اِلَى اللّٰهِ (زمر آیت ۳)"

And they said: "هؤلاء شفعاؤنا عندالله" that is, these (the deputies) are the ones that would intercede for them with the Supreme Lord. They vividly displayed their duplicity and hypocrisy on the occasion of the *hajj*, saying:

We are here; we are in thy Presence. Thou hast no partner except that which Thou lordest over and whose possessions Thou ownest.)

لَبَّيْكَ لَبَّيْكَ لَا شَرِيْكَ لَكَ اِلَّا شَرِيْكًا
هُوَ لَكَ تَمْلِكُهٗ وَمَا مَلَكَ

In sum, the idol-worshippers of Makkah held God to be the Supreme Being, with absolute power and dominion, regarding their pseudo gods as subservient to Him, and all the powers they attributed to them were bestowed by God. In spite of this they were but polytheists because they believed that after the grant of these administrative and executive powers, these deities were fully authorised to wield them like the officials.

Beliefs of the polytheist: Shah Wali Allah's view

Shāh Walī Allāh has clearly said in the *Ḥujjat Allāh al-Bālighah*, in the chapter entitled "Condition of People in the period of Ignorance and how the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) reformed it," that pre-Islamic Arabs of the Holy Prophet's time, acknowledged the institution of prophethood and divine punishment and retribution. They took active part in matters of common weal and culture. One of their acknowledged beliefs was that Allāh had no partner in the creation of the sky and earth and the elements between them. Neither did He have any partner in the determination of major matters nor could His commands be countermanded. His Decree and decision could not, likewise, be interfered with, when they became firm and absolute. Shāh Walī Allāh says:

> But one thing which turned them into heretics was their belief that there were some angels and spirits who regulated not only vital matters but other affairs of men also, for instance, ameliorating the condition of the devotee in respect of his person, offspring and property. These pagans liken the status of angels and spirits to that of the counsellors and amīrs vis-a-vis a monarch. The result of this misunderstanding was that many functions were entrusted to angels in the *sharī'ah* and it was clearly mentioned that the prayers of some elect persons were answered. This made people consider these prerogatives as their exclusive rights just like those of small rulers. Thus they speculated about the unseen on the basis of the seen. This is what led to disruption.

> لٰكِنْ كَانَ مِنْ زَنْدَقَتِهِمْ قَوْلُهُمْ اِنَّ
> هُنَاكَ اَشْخَاصًا مِّنَ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةِ وَالْاَرْوَاحِ
> تُدَبِّرُ اَهْلَ الْاَرْضِ فِيْمَا دُوْنَ الْاُمُوْرِ الْعِظَامِ
> مِنْ اِصْلَاحِ حَالِ الْعَابِدِ فِيْمَا يَرْجِعُ اِلٰى خُوَيْصَةِ
> نَفْسِهٖ وَاَوْلَادِهٖ وَاَمْوَالِهٖ وَشَبَّهُوْهُمْ بِحَالِ
> الْمُلُوْكِ بِالنِّسْبَةِ اِلٰى مَلِكِ الْمُلُوْكِ وَبِحَالِ
> الشُّفَعَآءِ وَالنُّدَمَآءِ بِالنِّسْبَةِ اِلَى السُّلْطَانِ
> الْمُتَصَرِّفِ بِالْجَبَرُوْتِ وَمَنْشَأُ ذٰلِكَ مَا نَطَقَتْ
> بِهِ الشَّرَآئِعُ مِنْ تَفْوِيْضِ الْاُمُوْرِ اِلَى الْمَلٰٓئِكَةِ
> وَاِسْتِجَابَةِ دُعَاءِ الْمُقَرَّبِيْنَ مِنَ النَّاسِ فَظَنُّوْا
> ذٰلِكَ تَصَرُّفًا مِّنْهُمْ كَتَصَرُّفِ الْمُلُوْكِ قِيَاسًا
> لِّلْغَآئِبِ عَلَى الشَّاهِدِ وَهُوَ الْفَسَادُ۔
>
> (حجۃ اللّٰہ البالغہ صـ ۱۲۵)

Elaboration of the distinction between the creed of the Muslims and the Polytheists

What Shāh Walī Allāh has written points to a great and clear distinction between the belief of the polytheists and that of the Muslims. The latter also believe—and this stands proven from the texts of both the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth*—that there are many affairs entrusted to the angels. Many affairs are managed by them. Some look after the rains, some after death, and so on. The polytheists also believed that the creation of the sky, the earth, and mankind was the work of God and He has no partner in this. But He has under Him angels who have been delegated the administration of the daily occurrences. The difference between the creed of the polytheists and that of the Muslims lies in this that the former believe the powers of the angels to emanate from God, but at the same time hold that they were autonomous and in using them they possessed full authority. Hence they offered them worship in order to propitiate them. In other words they adored them lest they should be displeased and inflict upon them calamity and trouble, It is like the authorities acting on their own in execution of public affairs without consulting the king. In fact the king does not even know what is happening. Being fully authorised they do whatever they think fit. This is the belief of the polytheists.

The Muslims believe that, although God has delegated executive powers to the angels, this does not mean that they are independent and free to act in any way they please. It is an article of faith with them that whatever happens on the surface of the earth or deep inside it or in the depths of the ocean is at His behest, so far so that even if a leaf falls that is known to God and it falls with God's command.

وَعِنْدَهٗ مَفَاتِحُ الْغَيْبِ لَا يَعْلَمُهَآ اِلَّا هُوَ ط
وَيَعْلَمُ مَا فِى الْبَرِّ وَالْبَحْرِ وَمَا تَسْقُطُ مِنْ وَّرَقَةٍ اِلَّا
يَعْلَمُهَا وَلَا حَبَّةٍ فِىْ ظُلُمٰتِ الْاَرْضِ وَلَا رَطْبٍ وَّ
لَا يَابِسٍ اِلَّا فِىْ كِتٰبٍ مُّبِيْنٍ (الانعام، آیت ٥٩)

And with Him are the keys of the invisible. None but He knoweth them. And He knoweth what is in the land and the sea. Not a leaf falleth but He knoweth it, not a grain amid the darkness of the earth, naught of wet or dry but (it is noted) in a clear record. (Qur'ān, 6:59)

Every grain that sprouts from the depth of the soil anywhere does so at God's Command.

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ فَالِقُ الْحَبِّ وَالنَّوٰى يُخْرِجُ
الْحَىَّ مِنَ الْمَيِّتِ وَمُخْرِجُ الْمَيِّتِ مِنَ الْحَىِّ
(الانعام آیت ٩٦)

Lo! Allāh (it is) Who splitteth the grain of corn and the date-stone (for sprouting.) He bringeth forth the living from the dead, and is the bringer-forth of the dead from the living. (Qur'ān, 6:95)

What is happening in the womb is within His Knowledge.

اَللّٰهُ يَعْلَمُ مَا تَحْمِلُ كُلُّ اُنْثٰى وَمَا تَغِيْضُ
الْاَرْحَامُ وَمَا تَزْدَادُ ط (الرعد، آیت ٨)

Allāh knoweth that which every female beareth and that which the wombs absorb and that which they grow. (Qur'ān, 13:8)

All the changes that take place within the womb are at the behest of God. The angels appointed by Him in this respect do not have the slightest authority. As the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* has it.

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ قَدْ وَكَّلَ بِالرَّحِمِ مَلَكًا فَيَقُوْلُ
اَىْ رَبِّ نُطْفَةٌ اَىْ رَبِّ عَلَقَةٌ اَىْ رَبِّ مُضْغَةٌ
فَاِذَآ اَرَادَ اللّٰهُ اَنْ يَّقْضِىَ خَلْقًا قَالَ الْمَلَكُ
اَىْ رَبِّ ذَكَرٌ اَوْ اُنْثٰى شَقِىٌّ اَوْ سَعِيْدٌ فَمَا
الرِّزْقُ فَمَا الْاَجَلُ فَيُكْتَبُ كَذٰلِكَ فِىْ بَطْنِ
اُمِّهٖ (مسلم ص ٣٣٣ ج ٢)

God has appointed an angel within the womb who asks Him "O Lord! shall I make it into the *sperma hominis*? O Lord! shall I clothe it with flesh? O Lord! shall I carve a foetus out of it?" And, when God the Almighty ordains birth, the angel supplicates Him saying, "O Lord! shall I make it into a male or a female, fortunate or unfortunate? How much shall be his livelihood? What shall be his span of life?" So all this is spelt out in the mother's womb.
(*Muslim:* Vol. 2, p. 333)

وَفِىْ رِوَايَةٍ فَيَقُوْلُ يَا رَبِّ اَذَكَرٌ اَوْ اُنْثٰى
فَيَجْعَلُهُ اللّٰهُ ذَكَرًا اَوْ اُنْثٰى ثُمَّ يَقُوْلُ يَا رَبِّ
اَسَوِىٌّ اَوْ غَيْرُ سَوِىٍّ فَيَجْعَلُهُ اللّٰهُ سَوِيًّا اَوْ غَيْرَ
سَوِىٍّ ثُمَّ يَقُوْلُ يَا رَبِّ مَا رِزْقُهٗ مَا اَجَلُهٗ مَا
خُلُقُهٗ وَفِىْ رِوَايَةٍ فَيَقُوْلُ يَا رَبِّ اَشَقِىٌّ اَوْ سَعِيْدٌ

Another report says that (the angel) asks God, "O Lord! shall I give it the figure of male or female" So God the Almighty makes it one of them. The angel asks again, "O Lord! shall it be perfect or imperfect." And God the Almighty creates it this or that way. The angel again says, "O Lord! how shall he make his living? What shall be his ways and habits?" And one report has it that he asks. "Shall he be unlucky or lucky?"

Even about the sun which has been made by God to shed light and which some polytheists have taken for a deity, the Muslims believe that it rises and sets by God's permission; itself it has no power to do so. This has been mentioned in a *ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth.* There are several proofs and examples to this effect both in the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* which show that Muslims do not vouch for the least autonomous power to any degree in any matter to anyone except God. Although some ignorant and misguided persons do attribute such power to persons other than God out of sheer folly, ignorance and fatuation, which apparently resembles the attitude of the polytheists, yet there is a world of difference between the two, in so far as conviction is concerned.

Associating partners with Allah in respect of form

Over against this the polytheists vest their gods with permanent powers and it is why they consider them deserving of worship and worship them in order to please them. They think that if they do not adore them or supplicate them for succour and do not implore them for rescue, the gods would bring down upon them some calamity and misfortune or loss to them. This kind of *shirk* is associated with "creativeness" or the power of the supreme Authority to get done what it ordains.

The other form of *shirk* relates to *tashrī'*. This lies in ascribing to such subservient powers or human being powers that are God's and in arbitrarily fixing what is prohibited and permissible and *vice versa.* This was the attitude of the Christians with respect to their bishops. As a positive proof, Al-Ibn Athīr has chronologically recorded in his *Kāmil* how Christian clergy assembled in such and such year and how they revised and reversed many a law enjoining prohibition and *vice versa.* After that, all these things became lawful, although they were, according to the text of their scripture, clearly prohibited. At the behest of the bishop what was tabu became permissible. The Jews had a similar notion regarding their *rabbīs* that whatever they declared to be lawful would have legal sanction, no matter if it was not so *per se.* Likewise, whatever they declared prohibited, would become unlawful (although it was lawful).

They have taken as lords besides Allāh their *rabbīs* and their monks and the Messiah Son of Mary. (Qur'ān, 9:31)	اِتَّخَذُوْٓا اَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ اَرْبَابًا مِّنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ وَالْمَسِيْحَ ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ (التوبہ، آیت ۳۱)

When this *āyah* descended, 'Adī bin Ḥātim who was a Christian before accepting Islam, told the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) that the Christians did not worship their clergy and asked how they could be regarded as gods.

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: Verily, they worshipped them not but what they declared permissible was taken as permitted and what they declared prohibited was taken as prohibited.	فَقَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اِنَّهُمْ لَمْ يَكُوْنُوْا يَعْبُدُوْنَهُمْ وَلٰكِنَّهُمْ كَانُوْٓا اِذَا اَحَلُّوْا لَهُمْ شَيْئًا اِسْتَحَلُّوْهُ وَاِذَا حَرَّمُوْا عَلَيْهِمْ شَيْئًا حَرَّمُوْهُ ۔

Distinction between the second type of *Shirk* and following the Imams

This shows the difference between the practice of the Muslims in following the Imāms who exercised *ijtihād* in matters of the *sharī'ah* and acting upon their rulings and the heinous practice of the Jews and

Christians. This is all too obvious. The Jews and the Christians attribute absolute powers to their priests and pontiffs to allow or prohibit anything. We, however, do not acknowledge in the least the authority of the Imāms and the religious doctors in respect of the framing of laws. "Indeed there is no power to ordain except God," says the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) : "ان الحکم الا لله". Since whatever the Apostle of God says is proof positive for a thing being made lawful or unlawful by God; for this reason we follow into the footsteps of the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم).

As for following the Imāms this depends largely on the reliance placed on the dictum of those steeped in learning in proportion to their penetrating insight. Shāh Walī Allāh has made a very clear and categorical statement in this behalf. He says :

And the secret thereof that is regarding some as competent to declare things lawful or unlawful is to place them at par with God, lies in the fact that permitting or prohibiting a thing means issuing an order in Heaven that such and such actions would be accountable or non-accountable. The mere announcement of this constitutes the presence and absence of accountability which is out and out an exclusive prerogative of God. Attributing the declaration of things being lawful or unlawful to the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) means that his command about things permitted or prohibited is the absolute reflection of the Divine Sanction. The attribution of such powers to the *mujtahids* means that they either deduce it from the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) or derive it from God's own Words.

وَسِرُّ ذٰلِكَ اَنَّ التَّحْلِيْلَ وَالتَّحْرِيْمَ عِبَارَةٌ
عَنْ تَكْوِيْنٍ نَافِذٍ فِي الْمَلَكُوْتِ اَنَّ الشَّيْءَ الْفُلَانِيَّ
يُؤَاخَذُ بِهٖ اَوْ لَا يُؤَاخَذُ بِهٖ فَيَكُوْنُ هٰذَا
التَّكْوِيْنُ سَبَبًا لِّلْمُؤَاخَذَةِ وَتَرْكِهَا وَهٰذَا مِنْ
صِفَاتِ اللّٰهِ تَعَالٰى وَاَمَّا نِسْبَةُ التَّحْلِيْلِ وَالتَّحْرِيْمِ
اِلَى النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَبِمَعْنٰى اَنَّ
قَوْلَهٗ اَمَارَةٌ قَطْعِيَّةٌ لِتَحْلِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَتَحْرِيْمِ اللّٰهِ
وَاَمَّا نِسْبَتُهَا اِلَى الْمُجْتَهِدِيْنَ مِنْ اُمَّتِهٖ
فَبِمَعْنٰى رِوَايَتِهِمْ ذٰلِكَ عَنِ الشَّرْعِ مِنْ نَّصِّ
الشَّارِعِ اَوْ اِسْتِنْبَاطِ مَعْنًى مِّنْ كَلَامِهٖ ؞

In short, therefore, *shirk* signifies considering any one's share in any attribute of God to any extent and regarding him autonomous in his action whether in the matter of execution or framing of decrees. Prostration before a being with such a belief is worshipping something other than God and is a glaring *shirk*; nay it is sheer idolatry. If he does not repent, he deserves to be executed as an apostate and consequently, consigned to hell for ever thereafter. But prostrating without such belief, merely out of reverence, ignorance, and misguidance, is out and out iniquity; it is unlawful, profanity innovation and a major sin according to the Islamic *sharī'ah*. He who is guilty of it is a transgressor and deserves punishment. However, despite all these blame-worthy matters, he cannot be considered guilty of committing glaring *shirk* or idolatry. This is the view adopted by the erudite and critical scholars of later times.

فَقَالَ لِلتَّرْجُمَانِ

When questioning was over Heraclius told his interpreter to tell Abū Sufyān that when he asked him about the genealogy of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) he said: "he is of high lineage amongst us"

كَذٰلِكَ الرُّسُلُ تُبْعَثُ فِي نَسَبِ قَوْمِهَا

And as such, prophets always come from noble families so that high-born people may not feel it contemptible to follow them. Persons of high families generally regard it an indignity to follow every insignificant person. Some have taken this question by Heraclius to imply that a Prophet is sent from amongst his own people and not others. However, God made an exception in the case of Prophet Lūṭ (عليه السلام) who was sent from amongst a different people and getting fed up with their wickedness, he expressed his desire in the following words:

> Would that I had strength to resist you or had some strong support (among you)! (Qur'ān, 11:80)
>
> لَوْ أَنَّ لِيْ بِكُمْ قُوَّةً أَوْ آوِيْ إِلَىٰ رُكْنٍ شَدِيْدٍ (ہود، آیت ۸۰)

These words escaped unwittingly from lips of Prophet Lūṭ (عليه السلام) in a state of extreme nervousness and perplexity, wishing he had his own family and people around him to serve as a sheet anchor. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has said: 'يرحم الله لوطا لقد كان ياوى الى ركن شديد' "May God have mercy on Lūṭ (عليه السلام)!" Indeed he was seeking a strong support. That is to say, Prophet Lūṭ (عليه السلام) was in reality seeking the succour of God the Almighty, but instead of that he desperately turned to material accessories in extreme embarrassment and perplexity. The Prophets who followed him all belonged to big communities. Prophet Lūṭ's prayer had been accepted by God and afterwards all the Prophets were sent to their own people.

But to interpret Heraclius's observation thus is absolutely wrong because this remark was in reply to Abū Sufyān's statement that he was of high lineage amongst them as the nunnation in the word "نسب" *nasabin* indicates that the Prophet had a high pedigree. Hence, the subsequent rehearsing of his words by Heraclius carried the same meaning—that he had a high lineage. And it is a fact that a Prophet arises in the noblest family in the whole community. The word "كذالك" clearly shows this. Taking the former interpretation, it is difficult to fit it in with "ذونسب" which refers to Abū Sufyān's reply. Then Heraclius, said, "when I asked you if anyone amongst you had ever put forward such a claim, did you not say 'No,'?"

لَقُلْتُ رَجُلٌ يَأْتَسِيْ بِقَوْلٍ قِيْلَ قَبْلَهُ

Had someone said this before him, I would have said this man was merely repeating something already said. What I meant was that if anyone had said such a thing before him, that is, if he had claimed to be a prophet, I would have said, he was following some old tradition and it is a fact that no one claimed prophethood for 600 years. It was only after his claim to prophethood that others made such claims sedulously; some of them in his own life-time. The purport of Heraclius's question was that if anyone else had made such a claim, he would have thought he was doing so to regain his erstwhile power and prestige. The word "قلت" occurs twice. The first means he said it *sotto voce* and the second that he said verbally.

قُلْتُ رَجُلٌ يَطْلُبُ مُلْكَ أَبِيْهِ

This question is related to Prophet's moral probity whereas the next pertains to worldly glory as to whether there had ever been a king among his ancestors. The *raison d'etre* of this question is that when any family gains authority, power, and kingship, then for a long time afterwards its members keep thinking of regaining them by various means. From Abū Sufyān's reply it seemed that the Holy Prophet's claim was based on true prophethood and it was not a stratagem for regaining a lost power and prestige. Heraclius also said that when he had earlier questioned Abū Sufyān whether the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had ever been accused of lying, his reply was in the negative.

فَقَدْ أَعْرِفُ أَنَّهُ لَمْ يَكُنْ لِيَذَرَ الْكَذِبَ عَلَى النَّاسِ وَيَكْذِبَ عَلَى اللهِ

That is, "I judge from this that the Prophet was not one who would heap lies upon men and lie unto God." He would, therefore, say with certainty that he who had never lied all his life, could not, all of a sudden, resort to the hoax of spurious prophethood. How could one who conducted himself in such a cautious manner in the affairs of men, adopt such an audacious attitude in a matter pertaining to God? Heraclius's object was that a prophet was surely accountable to God and it was because of this certainty that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) never made a wrong statement about any person. If so, how could he make a false claim and resort to imposture in a matter relating to God? It appears from this question of Heraclius that, belonging as he did to the people of the Scripture, he knew something from the Scripture about the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Hence, whatever cherished in his heart, now came on to his tongue. The purpose of this question also was that people of other countries should realise the Prophet's veracity and the genuineness of his claim to Prophethood, which would clear the way for Heraclius in proclaiming his faith in the Prophet's religion. Heraclius then said that when he had asked whether those who followed the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) were the poor or the high-born, Abū Sufyān had replied that they belonged to the former class.

And the fact is that "كذالك" only such people obey the وَهُمْ أَتْبَاعُ الرُّسُلِ Prophets. Heraclius says that it is a sign of prophethood that the depressed folk follow the Prophet. The followers of every true Prophet consist of those in the lower rung of society, since big people do not pay any heed to anything new. They are usually lost in luxury. When a society degenerates, men often get divided into classes like this. The rich are lost in the giddy whirl of pleasure and the poor are over-awed by them. However, they are always contemplating to free themselves from the shackles of the luxury-hunters, the rich, and, as soon as they get a firm support somewhere, they consign all their power to it. Heraclius then says that to his question as to whether the followers of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) were increasing or diminishing, Abū Sufyān had said they were increasing.

And this state of affairs continues till the faith وَكَذٰلِكَ أَمْرُ الْإِيمَانِ حَتّٰى يَتِمَّ consummates. Further, Heraclius said that when he asked whether anyone embracing Islam ever receded, Abū Sufyān had replied in the negative.

And this is really the essence of faith. وَكَذٰلِكَ الْإِيمَانُ حِينَ تُخَالِطُ بَشَاشَتُهُ When its stimulating effect permeates the heart, that is its joy and vivacity become an integral part of the heart and gets saturated in it, then it becomes very difficult to dislodge it. Scholars agree that only those who have not accepted the message with full conviction are likely to apostatise. Heraclius then says that when he asked whether the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had ever fallen short of commitments, his reply was also in the negative.

Similarly, the Prophets never break their pledge. وَكَذٰلِكَ الرُّسُلُ لَا تَغْدِرُ Then Heraclius said, "when I questioned you about his teaching you stated: "He commands us to worship God only, not to set any partners with Him and to give up idolatry, as also to say prayers and be true and virtuous."

"If what you say is true, then very soon the فَسَيَمْلِكُ مَوْضِعَ قَدَمَيَّ هَاتَيْنِ whole of this country which is underneath my feet (Palestine) would fall under this sway. That is the day is not far off when this country would fall within the domain of Islam."

"I never dreamt that the Holy Prophet وَلَمْ أَكُنْ أَظُنُّ أَنَّهُ مِنْكُمْ

(صلى الله عليه وسلم) would be from amongst you." That is Heraclius was sure that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was about to make his appearance, but he never imagined that he would spring from such ignorant and uncivilized people. It is possible, as the Infidels of Makkah used to say: "لو لا نزل هذا القران على رجل من القريتين عظيم" "Why was the Qur'ān not made to descend upon some noble person of Ṭā'if and Makkah?" Heraclius may also have thought that a major prophet would arise in a big people. After that Heraclius said that had he been sure of reaching the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he would certainly have tried to do so and washed his feet. The tenor of Heraclius's statement shows that in this case he faced the danger of deposition and fear of other losses.

ثُمَّ دَعَا بِكِتَابِ رَسُولِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ الَّذِى بَعَثَ بِهِ مَعَ دِحْيَةَ الْكَلْبِيِّ

After expressing his ideas, Heraclius called for the letter which the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had sent through Diḥyah Kalbī to the chief of Baṣrā, Ḥārith bin Abī Shimr Ghassānī. It is a matter of general practice that access to the court of potentates lies through proper channel and nothing is accepted if not routed properly. The invitation addressed by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was first sent, therefore, to the chief of Baṣrā. When Heraclius learned about the Holy Prophet's claim, he first investigated his antecedents and then paid attention to his letter. It was also a custom in those times that the messengers of such letter should not have ugly looks. Only a handsome person should be despatched and Ḥaḍrat Diḥyah Kalbī was an extremely graceful person. Writers of Biographies say that when he was in Shām women came out of their houses to have a look at him, and it was for this reason that the Angel Jibra'īl used to appear in the form of Diḥyah Kalbī because the angels like a comely appearance. Another point may be that, just as God sent the Dīn (Islam) to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) through Jibra'īl, similarly, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) by the same token sent to the most powerful monarch of his time a person in whose form the Angel Jibra'īl used to appear. In this way between the Messenger of God and the Messenger of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) obvious resemblance existed.

The Murder of Chosroe

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had at that time also sent a letter to the then Sasanide emperor of Īrān, Khusraw Parwīz. That was despatched through 'Abd Allāh bin Hadhāfah Sahmī. According to the practice of the Arabs and the natural mode of address, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had begun it thus: "من محمد رسول الله الى كسرى" "From Muḥammad, Messenger of God, to Kisrā." When Khusraw saw that the Name of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) preceded his, he flew into rage because of extreme vanity and pride and tore up the letter. When the bearer of the message reported the contemptuous and haughty comportment of Khusraw Parwīz, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) prayed, "O God, tear into pieces their land as he has torn my letter," or he gave the news that it had been shattered to pieces, that is, it was doomed to destruction. This curse applied both to the lives and the empire of the Khusroes. The deaths of the rulers had taken place during the very lifetime of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The wretch who treated the Prophet's letter with such contempt was Khusraw Perwīz. He met with a gruesome death soon after. He had a mistress named Shīrīn who was very beautiful. His own son, Shīrūjaah, had also fallen in love with her. It was difficult for Shīrūjaah to seek the gratification of his desire so long as his father remained alive. He, therefore, slew his father at night but could not get hold of Shīrīn. Khusraw Perwīz, an equally treacherous father, had put poison in a bottle marked as an aphrodisiac in the royal storehouse of medicines. When the patricide ascended the throne, being an utterly profligate, he became interested in such medicines. So he went into the storehouse of medicines and seeing the bottle labelled "approdisiac", drank the poison and died. Several monarchs died one after another so that no suitable descendent of the royal house remained who could occupy the throne. Hence a princess was enthroned. Hearing this the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) remarked: 'لن يفلح قوم ولوا امرهم امرأة' "A nation that entrusts its affairs to a woman, can not fare well."

It is also related in books of history that Khusraw Perwīz did not content himself with tearing up the Holy Prophet's letter but also wrote to his Governor at Ṣan'ā, a neighbouring country to Ḥijāz, that the head of the insolent person who placed his name before his should be cut off and sent to him, otherwise the Governor himself would be beheaded. The Governor at first sent two messengers who stayed with the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said one day that they should go and tell the Governor of Ṣan'ā that his Lord had been slain by the Holy Prophet's Lord that very night. They noted the date and went away. They told the Governor about the sublime status of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and mentioned the information about Chosroe, On inquiry the Governor came to know that Khusraw Perwīz had been slain that very night by his own son. It has also been said that the Governor of Ṣan'ā embraced Islam thereafter. Heraclius read the letter in which it was written :

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ، مِنْ مُحَمَّدٍ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ وَرَسُوْلِهٖ اِلٰى هِرَقْلَ عَظِيْمِ الرُّوْمِ سَلَامٌ عَلٰى مَنِ اتَّبَعَ الْهُدٰى

"In the name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful. This letter is from Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم), the slave of Allāh and His Apostle, to Hearclius, the ruler of the Byzantine. Peace be upon him that follows the right path."

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had addressed Heraclius as the chief of Byzantine. Hearing this, his nephew got irate and said that the letter should be torn because it had failed to observe the royal etiquette, the writer putting his name before that of the emperor who had been called the Chief of Byzantine and not Sulṭān or Lord of Byzantine.

Heraclius was at cross with his nephew and said that if the writer was really a Prophet, he had the right to place his name before his. Moreover, he (Heraclius), was not the Lord or Master; the real master was only God. He was called the chief of the Byzantinians because of his being their ruler. The words, "سلام على من اتبع الهدى" "Peace be upon him that follows the right path," had a peculiar kind of gentleness, which forced Heraclius to ponder because he regarded himself as a follower of a Divine Scripture and rightly guided. The Holy Prophet's words imply that, if he were in the right, he deserved peace; otherwise not.

Gentleness in Correspondence

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) addressed Heraclius as the Chief of the Byzantine. His inherent nobleness of nature did not permit him to speak discourteously to others. On the other hand, it teaches us extreme courtesy even towards enemies. This shows that in corresponding with people of high rank the use of a befitting mode of address is not against Islamic teachings. Another advantage in this is that, even if the enemy is not disposed to be friendly at least his hostility would be lessened.

Once the Governor of the United Provinces (now Utter Paradesh) Mr. Marston, visited Deoband and the authorities of the Dār al-'Ulūm arranged a reception for him because of certain considerations. 'Allāmah Sayyid Anwar Shāh, was asked to say a few words of welcome as the Chairman of the Reception Committee. He was at a loss what to say, as Marston was the man who had ordered firing on a mosque in Kānpūr. But now he had gone there as the Chief Guest and the authorities of Deoband had to present an address. The Mawlānā says he instantly thought of this *hadīth* and used this very word 'عظیم'. Because of this precedent in the *Ḥadīth* he felt his heart at ease.

"I offer Islam to you. أَمَّا بَعْدُ فَإِنِّي أَدْعُوكَ بِدِعَايَةِ الْإِسْلَامِ أَسْلِمْ تَسْلَمْ يُؤْتِكَ اللهُ أَجْرَكَ مَرَّتَيْنِ
If you accept Islam you will be safe and God shall increase your reward twofold."

That is our object is the Islamic Mission. Islam being the religion of peace *par excellence*, we do not want to cause provocation for no rhyme or reason whatsoever or making an encroachment upon the authority of others. The words "*aslim taslam*" compre hend peace and security in both the worlds. Thus the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) assured him of peace. This was an invitation to Heraclius to ponder. Had he reflected upon these words deeply, he would have found means of spritual tranquillity in them, but his short-sightedness did not allow him to reach this point. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) has compressed in his letter all the modes of mandate and persuasion, sternness and admonition.

'*Aslim*' is mandatory while '*taslam*' is for persuasion. "فان تولیت" signifies admonition. These few words "فان علیک" of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) sound a note of warning and combine all the methods of inculcation. If a person from among those who believe in Scriptures, accepts the invitation, he would receive double reward. Firstly, because as a believer in the Divine Scriptures, he testified to the previous prophets and now he had the felicity of testifying to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) also. This is what the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) has called "یوتک الله اجرک مرتین" "God would grant you reward twice." The expression "مرتین" could mean also that he should not think he would be given only one reward on embracing Islam because through him Islam would go on spreading among his people, so that the reward will not remain confined to him alone. The more people would join Islam, the more his recompense would increase. This implication is borne out by what the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) says in the next sentence.

Islam and Muslim—Exclusive or General—Al-Suyuti's View

There is difference of opinion whether the word 'Islam' applies to the religion of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) only or it can be applied to all the revelatory religions. This gives rise to further difference also whether the word 'Muslim' exclusively pertains to the Ummah of Muḥammad (صلی الله علیه وسلم) or the Ummah of any prophet can be designated so. 'Allāmah Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ṣuyūtī has written a whole treatise on the subject called the *Itmam al-Ni'mah* (The Consummation of Boons) arguing that the words 'Islam' and 'Muslim' exclusively pertain to the religion of Islam and the *Ummah* of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). He has presented twenty-three arguments for this. The Qur'ānic text, however, goes against this because it has been said about Prophet Ibrāhīm (علیه السلام).

“كان حنيفاً مسلماً” “Indeed, he was a true Muslim.” and “اذقال له ربه اسلم قال آسلمت” “He was an upright man who had surrendered himself to Allāh!” and Similarly the Prophet Yūsuf (عليه السلام) also prayed: “توفنى مسلماً” “Make me to die submissive (unto Thee)”. (Qur’ān, 19:101) and the Prophet Sulaymān (عليه السلام) wrote to Bilqīs, the queen of Sab :— “وائتونى مسلمين” “Come unto me as those who surrendered”. (Qur’ān, 27:31) About the Prophet Lūt’s followers it has been said: “فما وجدنا فيها غيربيت من المسلمين” “.............................” (Qur’ān, 51:36) and about the Prophet Jesus’ companions:— “واشهد باننا مسلمون” “And bear thou witness that we have surrendered (unto Thee). (Qur’ān, 3:52)

Then, there are texts that negative the application of the word ‘Muslim’ exclusively to followers of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Al-Ṣuyūtī therefore devoted his efforts to an elaborate interpretation of these *āyāt* to prove his contention. The gist of this is that the term ‘Muslim’ has been applied specially to the prophets; that is, of the different Ummahs the word ‘Muslim Ummah’ is specific to that *Ummah* only which subscribes to the *Sharī‘ah* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), but the word Muslim can be applied to other prophets also. This explains its application to the prophets Ibrāhīm and Yūsuf. Then it was extended to the families of the prophets “بيت من المسلمين” also so that it carries this very meaning in respect of Lūt’s household. Similarly, where there is a single prophet in a community it is called Muslim. Thus “واشهد باننا مسلمون” (*wa ashhad bi-annanā Muslimūna*) removes the doubt, for al-Suyūtī tends to think that among the companions of Prophet ‘Īsā (عليه السلام) were two or three prophets.

However, al-Ṣuyūtī’s view that the words ‘Islam’ and ‘Muslim’ are specific to the *Sharī‘ah* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is essentially correct, but to go into such subtle explanations and elaborate interpretations on minute matters in an exhaustive manner, is difficult. So al-Ṣuyūtī himself writes that when he had just completed his treatise and extinguished the lamp to go to bed when this *āyah* about the companions of Prophet ‘Īsā (عليه السلام) came to his mind and he realised that it refuted his stance, for whatever arguments he had advanced did not fit in with it. So he felt upset, re-lighted the lamp, and presented the argument given above.

The Writer’s View:

The best way to solve all these difficulties is that some overall view should be taken which should cover all shades of meaning. It is this that a word should linguistically have a general connotation but as a designation it should apply to a particular person or community only. For instance, the expression Ḥāfiẓ applies to those who memorize the Qur’ān, but among the *Muḥaddithīn* it applies specifically to Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar. Thus, whenever this word occurs in books on the *Ḥadīth* saying “So said Ḥāfiẓ,” Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar is meant. There are thousands of such words in all languages. For instance, the word ‘animal’ includes man also, but generally it signifies all animals except men, so that the word has become exclusive for them. Similarly, Islam and Muslim could be employed lexicographically for all religions that follow revealed scripture and there is no restriction on this broad use but, as designations these are exclusively applied to the Holy Prophet’s *Dīn* (Faith) and his *Ummah*. The appellation of honour has not been conferred on any *Ummah*. If it has been employed for them, it is only, in the lexicographic sense. The Qur’ān has alluded to this fact in the following words:-

> ......the faith of your father Ibrāhīm (is yours). He hath named you Muslims of old time and in this (Scripture), that the messenger may be a witness against you, and that ye may be witnesses against mankind. (Qur'ān, 22:78)

مِلَّةَ أَبِيكُمْ إِبْرَاهِيمَ ۚ هُوَ سَمَّاكُمُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ
مِن قَبْلُ وَفِي هَٰذَا لِيَكُونَ الرَّسُولُ شَهِيدًا عَلَيْكُمْ
وَتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى النَّاسِ ۚ (الحج آیت ۷۸)

The pronoun هوا refers either to God the Almighty or Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام). That is God gave you this name in the previous scriptures and in the Qur'ān, or Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) gave this name when he said in his prayer :—

> Our Lord! And make us submissive unto Thee and of our seed a nation submissive unto Thee. (Qur'ān, 2:128)

رَبَّنَا وَاجْعَلْنَا مُسْلِمَيْنِ لَكَ وَمِن
ذُرِّيَّتِنَا أُمَّةً مُّسْلِمَةً لَّكَ ص (بقرہ آیت ۱۲۸)

And probably this title has been lifted from this very verse in the Qur'ān. This shows that the words 'Islam' and 'Muslim' are for the *Ummah* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) only. So that the difficulty is resolved. All the subsidiary applications would depend upon this main connotation.

فَإِنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ فَإِنَّ عَلَيْكَ إِثْمَ الْأَرِيسِيِّينَ

That is, if you reject this invitation, then the sin of all your subjects and the peasantry would fall on your shoulders because their acceptance of Islam would be hindered by your action. Here the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has said "تولیت" "turning his back," and not "فان كفرت" "If you persist in heathenism" because in the latter case the invitation would have lost its genuine nature. The excellence of an invitation lies in the fact that its tone should be gracious, with nothing deprecatory. If the address is peremtory, it does not show that the person extending the call has any sympathy whatsoever. The word *arīs*' means the cultivator. But it is also employed for landowners, whether they cultivate the land on their own or lease it for cultivation. As Heraclius's subjects were mostly agriculturists, hence it is they who have been particularly mentioned, nevertheless, indirectly all his subjects are meant thereby.

Just as a good deed counts for reward, similarly providing means to others for doing good also deserves reward. The same thing is true of evil also for just as it is a sin to do evil, similarly providing means of doing evil to others is also a sin.[1]

God is to be thanked, for, through His Grace, we have been able to expound the *Kitāb al-Waḥī*.

Now it is the *Kitāb al-Īmān* (the book of Belief) that commences. Once the infallible nature and the truth of *waḥī* has been acknowledged, all that is a part of the revelatory experience shall have to be believed and it is this belief or faith that is known as *īmān*. This is the reason why Imām Bukhārī has written the *Kitāb al-Īmān* immediately after the *Kitāb al-Waḥī*.

---

[1] For further discussion on inviting Heraclius to Islam on the basis of committing of belief in the Unity of God, justification of *ijtihād* exercised by the Imāms and the effect of the incident or Abū Sufyān, vol. 1, pp. 231, of the original work may be consulted. *Ed.*

CHAPTER II

(The Book of Faith)

In the Name of Allāh, Who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful

(This chapter is) about the statement of the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) that the edifice of Islam rests upon five things or cardinal principles.

Faith consists of both saying and action. It increases and decreases. The following revelations of Allāh bear upon this subject :

(i) In order that they might add faith unto their faith (48:4)
(ii) And we increased them in guidence (18:13)
(iii) Allāh increaseth in right guidance those who walk aright (19:76)
(iv) While as for those who walk aright, He addeth to their guidance, and giveth them their protection (against evil) (47:17)
(v) And that believers may increase in faith (74:31)
(vi) Which one of you hath thus increased in faith? As for those who believe, it hath increased them in faith and they rejoice therefor (9:124)
(vii) Therefore fear them. But (the threat of danger) increased the efaith of them. (3:173)
(viii) It did but confirm them in their faith and resignation. (33:22)

According to the *Hadīth*, to bear love for the sake of God and to bear hate too for His sake, constitute faith.

'Umar bin Abdul 'Azīz wrote to 'Adī bin 'Adī, faith comprises duties, laws, matters prohibited and permitted and the *sunnah* Whosoever falls short of fulfilling them fails to measure up to the profession of his faith. If I happen to live, I shall tell you all about these things so that you may act upon them. And if I die, I am not avid for your company."

The Prophet Ibrāhīm (*'alaihi al-salām*) said, I wish my heart to be at ease. (2:260) Ma'ādh said to his companion Aswad bin Hilāl, "Let us sit down for a little while so that we may talk about faith." Ibn Mas'ūd said, "firm belief is the whole faith." And Ibn 'Umar said, "A person cannot understand what piety really means unless he casts out all misgivings from his heart (which perplex it)."

And Mujāhid said in explanation of the *āyah* "شرع اكم من الدين ما وصىابه نوحا" He hath ordained for you that religion which He commanded unto Noah) (42:13) that it meant, "O Muḥammad, We made the same ordainment to you as We did unto him (Noah)."

And Ibn 'Abbās interpreted *shir'atah* and *minhajan* (Laws and Islamic Institutes) as the Islamic way and the *Sunnah*. And explaining this *āyah*, he said, "دعا وكم", here meant "your faith".

كِتَابُ الْإِيمَانِ

بِسْمِ اللهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

بَابٌ قَوْلِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بُنِيَ الْإِسْلَامُ عَلَى خَمْسٍ وَهُوَ قَوْلٌ وَفِعْلٌ وَيَزِيدُ وَيَنْقُصُ قَالَ اللهُ تَعَالَى لِيَزْدَادُوا إِيمَانًا مَعَ إِيمَانِهِمْ وَزِدْنَاهُمْ هُدًى وَيَزِيدُ اللهُ الَّذِينَ اهْتَدَوْا هُدًى وَالَّذِينَ اهْتَدَوْا زَادَهُمْ هُدًى وَآتَاهُمْ تَقْوَاهُمْ وَيَزْدَادَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِيمَانًا وَقَوْلِهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ أَيُّكُمْ زَادَتْهُ هٰذِهِ إِيمَانًا فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فَزَادَتْهُمْ إِيمَانًا وَقَوْلِهِ فَاخْشَوْهُمْ فَزَادَهُمْ إِيمَانًا وَقَوْلِهِ وَمَا زَادَهُمْ إِلَّا إِيمَانًا وَتَسْلِيمًا وَالْحُبُّ فِي اللهِ وَالْبُغْضُ فِي اللهِ مِنَ الْإِيمَانِ وَكَتَبَ عُمَرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ إِلَى عَدِيِّ ابْنِ عَدِيٍّ إِنَّ لِلْإِيمَانِ فَرَائِضَ وَشَرَائِعَ وَحُدُودًا وَسُنَنًا فَمَنِ اسْتَكْمَلَهَا اسْتَكْمَلَ الْإِيمَانَ وَمَنْ لَمْ يَسْتَكْمِلْهَا لَمْ يَسْتَكْمِلِ الْإِيمَانَ فَإِنْ أَعِشْ فَسَأُبَيِّنُهَا لَكُمْ حَتَّى تَعْمَلُوا بِهَا وَإِنْ أَمُتْ فَمَا أَنَا عَلَى صُحْبَتِكُمْ بِحَرِيصٍ وَقَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ وَلٰكِنْ لِيَطْمَئِنَّ قَلْبِي وَقَالَ مُعَاذٌ اجْلِسْ بِنَا نُؤْمِنْ سَاعَةً وَقَالَ ابْنُ مَسْعُودٍ الْيَقِينُ الْإِيمَانُ كُلُّهُ وَقَالَ ابْنُ عُمَرَ لَا يَبْلُغُ الْعَبْدُ حَقِيقَةَ التَّقْوَى حَتَّى يَدَعَ مَا حَاكَ فِي الصَّدْرِ وَقَالَ مُجَاهِدٌ شَرَعَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الدِّينِ مَا وَصَّى بِهِ نُوحًا أَوْصَيْنَاكَ يَا مُحَمَّدُ وَإِيَّاهُ دِينًا وَاحِدًا وَقَالَ ابْنُ عَبَّاسٍ شِرْعَةً وَمِنْهَاجًا سَبِيلًا وَسُنَّةً وَدُعَاؤُكُمْ إِيمَانُكُمْ

All that Imām Bukhārī has said from the beginning to the end relates to the *aḥādīth* which form part of *waḥī*. Having indicated the germinal factors of *waḥī* to bring out its grandeur, truthfulness, infallibility, and veritability and devoting the first chapter to it by way of introduction so that the veritability and authoritativeness of the *ḥadīth* may be established, he now comes to the real purpose of the work, since the basis of all things is faith whether these are ethical matters, deeds or transactions in general. Hence he has given prime position to the Book of Faith after the Book of Revelation.

The fact of *waḥī* being true spells out the relation between man and God. The question is how to express this relationship. Faith and belief are the root while the actions are branches thereof. Faith is like the soul while Islam is its physical frame. Faith is the reality and Islam its external mould. It is through Faith alone that we acquire belief in and assurance about matters hidden and all that is invisible without any argumentation or ratiocination.

Different Muslim Sects

Of the different sects in the world, Muslim sects are those which claim to be Muslims and associated themselves with Islam, irrespective of whether they are rightly guided or not. Thus the Rawāfiḍ[1], Kharijites, the Mutazilites, the Murjiatites, the Karamiatites and the Jahmiyatites, soon associate themselves with Islam, but all of them are undoubtedly heterodox and have swerved from the right path of Islam.

The Sunnites

The only right directed Muslim sect is that of the Sunnites who follow the practice of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and his companions. This designation is derived from, and in fact, is a literal translation of the Holy Prophet's saying about the sect assured of salvation "ما انا علیه واصحابی" that is, the way to salvation lies in following the path of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and his Companions.

Different Sunnite Schools

The Sunnite sect itself comprises four sects, all of which are rightly directed. They have the same end and the same purpose; the difference is merely that of ratiocination. Only because of this the Sunnites are divided into four sub-sects, namely, (1) *The muḥaddithīn* who follow Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal and elucidate and propagate his statements and remarks on devotions; (2) The *mutakallimīn* who again comprise two groups: (i) the *Asharites* who mostly explain and publicise the views of Imām Mālik and Imām Shāfi'ī (ii) the *Māturīdites* who support and expound the statements attributed to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. There is only a slight difference between the two. The founder of the former is Imām Abū al-Ḥasan Ash'arī and of the latter Abū Al-Manṣūr Māturīdī. Both belonged to the same age, and were contemporary with Imām Ṭaḥāwī. Ash'arī was at first a Mutazilite and was associated for a long time with the Mutazilite theologian Abū 'Alī al-*Jubbā'ī*, and was a prime debater on his behalf. That is to say, he was like a sharp sword of the Mutazilites drawn against the Sunnites. But, later on, such are the ways of God, this very sword turned against the Mutazilites themselves.

---

[1] That is, the Shī'as in general and a sect of the Shī'as in particular, so named, because after vowing allegiance to Zayd, the grandson of Ḥaḍrat Ḥusayn, the maternal grandson of the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*), the original Rawāfiḍ backed out from it.

The incident which led his conversion to orthodoxy is like this.

It is related that once he resolved to go into seclusion for the whole month of Ramaḍān. One night during the first ten days of devotional seclusion, he saw in a dream the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) who said: "Abū al-Ḥasan, stand up in support of the religion." When he rose up in the morning, he did not feel upset about it. Since he believed that the Mutazilite creed to be the correct one, he had been supporting it vehemently and resorting to controversies thereon. He then had a similar dream after another ten days which rather upset him, as for him the real creed was that of the Mutazilites. Then he saw the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in a third dream in the third tenth when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) addressed him thus: "I told thee to rise up in support of Islam but thou hast not done so uptil now." Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī said to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in that very dream: "My lord, I do not know what faults there be in my creed. Do let me know them yourself." The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) thereupon replied: "I would not have budged from here till I apprised you fully of all your erroneous beliefs, had I not known that God has taken upon Himself the responsibility of bringing them home to you. That being so, I need not point them out."

So when Abū al-Ḥasan Ash'arī got up next morning he knew as it were by a flash all the beliefs of the Sunnites and the perverted notions of the Mutazilites stood manifest before him. That day happened to be Friday. He mounted the pulpit in the principal mosque in the city and renounced his belief in the Mutazilite creed publicly. From then onward he became a unique champion of the Sunnites. The *sufīs* or mystics form the fourth group of the Sunnites. The *muḥaddithīn* rely upon what has come down to them or what they have heard. They prove matters primarily with reference to what has been heard. The scholastics (*Mutakallameen*) whether Ash'arites or Muturidites, draw their inferences upon both of them and advance arguments on their basis. But this does not mean that they establish something new by exercising their intellect. On the other hand, they establish by means of rational arguments the beliefs that stand proved from the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* and aim at removing intellectual misapprehensions. Thus they synthesize the Intellect and Tradition to prove their credos.

What does faith signify? Not only Muslim sects in general but the Sunnites also differ about this. Hence it needs a little detailed examination. But since the Qur'ān has first of all employed the word *īmān* to the Arabs, we should see what it means in the Arabic language. It must be having some lexicographical meaning therein.

Literal Meaning of ***Imān***

The word *īmān* is derived from the word *aman*, the opposite of fear, that is mental composure. Thus *āman* means the decline of fear. The Qur'ān thus says:

......and (He) will give them in exchange safety after fear. (Qur'ān, 24:55)	وَلَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُمْ مِّنْ بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ أَمْنًا

Fear needs no elucidation. All of us know it. Hence its absence means peace and tranquillity. Modified into *īmān* it becomes equivalent to removal of fear.

This meaning of *īmān* obtains when the word is intransitive without any conjunction. And then the word, *īmān*, is used along with the conjunction "*ba*" as in the following *āyah* of the Qur'ān:

The messenger believeth in that which hath been revealed unto him from his Lord and (so do) the believers. Each one believeth in Allāh and His angels and His scriptures and His messengers.)
(Qur'ān, 2:285)

اٰمَنَ الرَّسُوْلُ بِمَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْهِ مِنْ رَّبِّهٖ
وَالْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ ؕ كُلٌّ اٰمَنَ بِاللّٰهِ وَمَلٰٓئِكَتِهٖ وَ
كُتُبِهٖ وَرُسُلِهٖ قف (بقرہ آیت ٢٨٥)

The same goes for "آمنت بالله وملائكته" that is, belief in Allāh and the angels. Here the word, *āmana*, cannot mean mitigation of fear, and the lexicographers themselves believe that when the conjunction of *bā* occurs, the meaning would be that of attestation or testimony or allegience (*taṣdīq* ;). *Taṣdīq* incorporates confession or profession, and the conjunction employed for the latter is *bā*. The word, *īmān*, also therefore is used with this conjunction, a point on which there is universal agreement. Beyond this point, however, there is some controversy as to whether the word should be understood in the sense of testimony literal or metaphorical. 'Allāmah Zamakhsharī himself has taken the word in both senses.

Some writers have subscribed to the view that both the removal of fear and testimony, attestation or allegiance are the real meanings of the word, *īmān*. This word is thus common to both. When used in the transitive sense on its own, the sense given by it would be that of removing of fear, but, when used together with the conjunction *bā*, it yields the second sense. Others have ascribed to it the interpretation that the real meaning of *īmān* is mitigation of fear and bestowing tranquillity but then *taṣdīq* also implies security from falsehood and lie. For instance, a man who has uttered a statement might harbour a fear lest what he has said may be contradicted or proved false by the listener, but, when the latter has supported what he has said, the hearer has relieved the speaker from the fear of being falsified.

Further, *īmān* is employed in the sense of testimony (*taṣdīq*) and at times in the literal sense it is used with *lām* as the conjunction, as in the Holy Qur'ān

......and thou believest not our sayings even when we speak the truth.
(Qur'ān, 12:17)

وَمَآ اَنْتَ بِمُؤْمِنٍ لَّنَا وَلَوْ كُنَّا صٰدِقِيْنَ (یوسف آیت ١٧)

It should be quite obvious that here the implication is neither of testimony nor of making secure, the more so as the conjunction of *taṣdīq* is not *lām*. In this case the sense is that of obedience, and we have therefore to interpret the word in a different sense. For instance, if someone has supplied information regarding the happening of an event at a certain place, and another has testified to it, then the person who has testified has, by implication, affirmed the veracity of that report. The word *inqiyād* (following) is used with *lām* as the conjunction while *taṣdīq* is also used with *lām* as the conjunction as in the Qur'ān, e.g., "مصدقا لما بين يدى" "*muṣaddiqan limā bayna yadiehe*" and "مصدقا للذين" "*muṣaddiqan lil ladhīna*" and from this standpoint *īmān* is also used with the conjunction, *lām*. This meaning is contained very appropriately in the following *āyah*:

Shall we put faith in two mortals like ourselves, and whose folk are servile unto us?
(Qur'ān, 23:47)

اَنُؤْمِنُ لِبَشَرَيْنِ مِثْلِنَا وَقَوْمُهُمَا لَنَا
عٰبِدُوْنَ (المؤمنون آیت ٤٧)

The Pharaoh and his chiefs were questioning the veracity of the Message of God as revealed to the Prophets Mūsā and Hāroon (عليهما السلام)

and could not think of becoming their followers, especially as they were, according to their own thinking, like themselves and therefore having no points of superiority over them. Moreover, they were averse all the more to the idea of subserving them as they held the Israelites to be in bondage to them.

There is still another sense in which *īmān*, has been used, although this use is very rare. The author of *Lisān al-ʻArab* has said that, despite diligent search, this form of its use is not to be found anywhere except in a *ḥadīth*, in which it has been used with the conjunction, *ʻalā*. This *ḥadīth* has that God has not sent any prophet but bestowed upon him certain signs which would make the people believe.

But such aspects of faith were pointed out which could form the basis of faith.

إِلَّا أُعْطِيَ مِنَ الْآيَاتِ مَا مِثْلُهُ آمَنَ عَلَيْهِ الْبَشَرُ

This is because testimony also signifies confidence. When the listener testifies to the speaker's statement, he impliedly reposes confidence in him. Had he not trusted his statement, he would not have testified the same.

In sum, therefore, *īmān* has been employed in four ways: (i) in the sense of a transitive verb in the objective sense of being made secure ; (ii) with *bā*, in the sense of testimony or seconding; (iii) with *lām* in the sense of subserving and following; (iv) with *ʻalā* in the sense of confidence. The last is extremely rare. The first occurs at times as a transitive verb with two objects. This too fissions off into two forms: the second passive is at times directly, as in “آمنته غيرى” *āmantuhū ghayrī* and sometimes indirectly with the preposition, *min* as in “آمنهم من خوف” *āmanhum min khawfin.*

Significance in *Shariʻah*

The *Sharīʻah* has taken faith to be in the sense of testimony. The word *taṣdīq* which means testimony, was originally a simple and straightforward word. With Greek logic coming into our hands in the form of translations, it was metamorphosed into a word that began to be associated progressively with philosophical connotations; used in this sense, it began to gain in ascendancy over us.

Whenever therefore the word, *taṣdīq*, is used, we tend to associate it with a logical significance, and are also confronted with several problems in the wake of the use of this word. It is therefore necessary that we should now discuss the word, *taṣdīq*, in its lexicographic context in order to establish its distinction from its scholastic or logical context. The lexicographic meaning of *taṣdīq* is to testify, out of one's free will, to a report or the veracity of a reporter, while according to the logicians and scholastics it is a kind of knowledge of the highest degree of comprehension which is called *taṣdīq*. It is obvious that knowledge is at times volitional and at other non-volitional which we acquire in spite of ourselves. Even, if we attempt to drive such *taṣdīq* out of our mind, we cannot do so. For instance the knowledge and attestation at noon of the sun having risen and similar phenomena. A logician affirms both types of knowledge whether volitional or otherwise. Thus the difference between lexicographical and logical attestation comes out inasmuch as in the former the testifier verifies a report or a statement or an incident (e.g., a miracle) out of his own volition, while the latter does not posit the exercise of volition.

Another distinction between these two is that if a man has sure knowledge of something by arguments, nevertheless, he denies it out of sheer obstinacy, even then, the matter has logical though not verbal verification. For instance, X knows very well that such and such object belongs to Y, still he denies that Y is its owner. Although Y claims that the thing belongs to him but he does not testify to this fact. In such a case, X is in a position to verify logically the fact of ownership because he knows the matter very well but he lacks verbal affirmation because he does not say whether Y's and his claim are true. He persists in denying out of obstinacy. Thus, the difference between verbal and logical verification is of two kinds. In the first place, according to logicians, volition is not necessary for verification whereas the lexicographers consider it necessary. The second is that logical verification is *ipso facto* present when there is knowledge or apprehension of complete degree of information even though, the person who already knows this fact or law to be true, denies it out of obstinacy. But lexicographers maintain that it is necessary to attribute truth to the complete degree of information of one who maintains it. Mere denial and contradiction do not constitute verification.

It must, however, be borne in mind that the two differences, we have outlined in the foregoing paragraphs, are those that are based on the present day definition of logical testimony in works on philosophy and logic, according to which, the highest reach of apprehension is volitional or non-volitional and testimony being knowledge, can combine with denial and obstinacy. For them, testimony is a kind of knowledge or cognition, whereas, in the view of other logicians, it is among the adjuncts of cognition or epistemology. So they define it in another way.

Ibn Sina's Definition of Testimony

Thus the author of *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* (The Core of Meaning) has quoted from *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid* the definition of testimony according to the premier logician, Imām Ibn Sīnā. According to it, the meaning of testimony is to acknowledge and believe, which is the opposite of denial and falsification. The *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* has quoted the following words of Ibn Sīnā :

Logical testimony is that in respect of which and the concept whereof, knowledge is classified. It is identical with testimony which is called acknowledgement, the opposite of denial.	اَلتَّصْدِيْقُ الْمَنْطِقِيُّ الَّذِىْ قُسِّمَ الْعِلْمُ اِلَيْهِ وَاِلَى التَّصَوُّرِ هُوَ بِعَيْنِهِ اللُّغَوِيُّ الْمُعَبَّرُ عَنْهُ فِى الْفَارِسِيَّةِ بگرويدن اَلْمُقَابِلُ لِلتَّكْذِيْبِ -

Thus defined, semantic testimony and logical testimony are not different from each other. Both are one and the same. Volition, according to it, is necessary for logical testimony since acknowledging and belief are volitional acts after cognition. It is also necessary that such acts should be free from wilful denial and negation, since it has been explained that obstinacy means denial. In short, there is difference of opinion about the definition of logical testimony.

Once we grasp this point then, in the light of this fact, the position of a number of those people would be clarified about whom the Qur'ān itself states that, in spite of their heathenism and unbelief being absolutely definite and certain, they were fully aware of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) being true and were perfectly certain of his being an apostle of God. In the light of what has been said above, the fact comes out that, merely because of this knowledge and certainty on their part, it is not necessary that they should be possessing faith supported by testimony which constitutes the very essence thereof.

The Authority of *Sharḥ-e Wiqāyah* and 'Allamah Taftazani

It is because of this that there has been difference of opinion between Ṣadr al-Shar'īah, author of *Sharḥ al-Wiqāyah*, and 'Allāmah Taftāzānī. According to the former, the sort of testimony which is estimable is volitional. Thus he accepts the general definition of logical testimony which covers both volitional and non-volitional types. 'Allāmah Taftāzānī, however, denies that volition is a necessary adjunct thereof. Even, according to the terminology of logicians, testimony proper is volitional without any semblance of denial or obstinacy. Thus he has followed Ibn Sīnā in his definition of testimony.

We are not, however, concerned with the terminological significance of *taṣdīq* from the philosophical or logical point of view. This is a matter to be decided by the logicians among themselves. What we aim at, here, is that linguistically testimony does stipulate volition or option. If the logicians also say what Ibn Sīnā has said, 'well and good,' and, if, in defining testimony proper, they do not regard volition as necessary and postulate volition as an additional qualification for making faith estimable, as claimed by Ṣadr al-Shar'īah, let them do so.

Deterministic Knowledge and Faith Distinguished

The act of testimony is a matter of heart and volition. It is not merely knowledge and understanding which are sometimes acquired involuntarily by the very logic of circumstances. When these things are acknowledged and testified, then faith naturally imports testimony. Once we grasp this, the position in respect of many persons would be clarified, namely those about whom the Qur'ān itself informs us that they had full knowledge of and certainty about the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) being true and his apostleship being an indubitable fact, nevertheless, their being heretics and non-believers is absolutely definite and certain. Merely because of the knowledge and certainty they had, it does not become necessary that they should be credited with that testifying faith which constitutes the real essence of faith. This is because their knowledge and certainty were of involuntary type. They had such clear signs and proof before them, as bright as the day, that they could not, in ordinary course, fail to believe. It was just like the knowledge of the sun, having risen in the morning, to a person who can observe it shining at noon or like that of a person who sees a wall in front of him, the moment he opens his eyes and realises that it is there. But they were not prompted by their own intention to ascribe verity to it voluntarily; on the other hand, they obstinately denied it out of sheer vanity and haughtiness. Hence, God, the Almighty Himself has said the following about the People of the Book :

Those unto whom We gave the Scripture, recognise (this revelation) as they recognise their sons. But lo! a party of them knowingly conceal the truth.

(Qur'ān, 2:146)

اَلَّذِیْنَ اٰتَیْنٰهُمُ الْکِتٰبَ یَعْرِفُوْنَهٗ کَمَا
یَعْرِفُوْنَ اَبْنَآءَهُمْ ط وَاِنَّ فَرِیْقًا مِّنْهُمْ لَیَکْتُمُوْنَ
الْحَقَّ وَهُمْ یَعْلَمُوْنَ ○ (بقرہ آیت ۱۴۶)

That is, they possess the knowledge of truth but they conceal and deny it. This shows that knowledge acquired in this manner cannot be called faith. God Himself has said at another place:

Lo! those who have received the Scripture know that (this Revelation) is the truth from their Lord. And Allāh is not unaware of what they do. (Qur'ān, 2:144)

وَإِنَّ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتٰبَ لَيَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّهُ الْحَقُّ مِن رَّبِّهِمْ ۗ وَمَا اللّٰهُ بِغَافِلٍ عَمَّا يَعْمَلُونَ (بقرہ آیت ۱۴۴)

About the Pharaoh and his followers, it has been explicitly stated:

And they denied them, though their souls acknowledged them, for spite and arrogance. (Qur'ān, 27:14)

وَجَحَدُوا بِهَا وَاسْتَيْقَنَتْهَا أَنفُسُهُمْ ظُلْمًا وَعُلُوًّا ۚ (النمل آیت ۱۴)

And thus does Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) address the Pharoah:

He said: in truth thou knowest that none sent down these (portents) save the Lord of the heavens and the earth as proofs... (Qur'ān, 17:102)

قَالَ لَقَدْ عَلِمْتَ مَا أَنزَلَ هٰؤُلَاءِ إِلَّا رَبُّ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْأَرْضِ بَصَائِرَ ۚ (بنی اسرائیل آیت ۱۰۲)

Meaning of *Īmān* in *Shar'īah*

Let us now try to understand the meaning of *īmān* according to the *shar'īah*:

After knowing clearly what the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) has brought, testimony briefly of what has been briefly stated and detailed testimony of what has been given in detail, is called *imān*.

هُوَ التَّصْدِيقُ بِمَا عُلِمَ مَجِيءُ الرَّسُولِ بِهِ ضَرُورَةً إِجْمَالًا فِيمَا عُلِمَ إِجْمَالًا وَتَفْصِيلًا فِيمَا عُلِمَ تَفْصِيلًا

That is, after due knowledge is acquired about something that it has been brought by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) from God, to declare and believe it as true, means faith. The words used herein should be noted carefully: to declare and believe any matter, not merely knowing it as such. Thus interpreted, the element of deliberate acknowledgement becomes all important.

Due knowledge means that the Muslims at large are generally aware of its being a matter of faith, and, when we say Muslims at large, we mean those Muslims only who possess interest in religious matters. As regards those who are wholly ignorant of them, knowing nothing about religion nor having any relish or zest for it and matters relating thereto, their awareness or unawareness is of little account; as for instance, modern educated people many of whom are only nominally Muslims. They do not have the slightest interest in or attachment to Islam nor do they know anything about religious matters. Many of them have passed a major portion of their lives in London, Paris and Berlin, the abodes of heathenism. The cardinal tenets of faith prayers, fasting, *Ḥajj*, and *Zakāt* are known to all Muslims as enjoined by Islam. All these stand proved as precedents from the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). When anything is established as a religious tenet in such a way that though not in the nature of a duty or obligation, it still forms a practice of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and is therefore approbious compliance whereof, which brings reward but non-compliance does not constitute a sin, nevertheless, the fact of its being valid in *shar'īah* and the proof of its emanating from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) have reached the extent of persistent reporting and positive information. Any one who denies it is an infidel and belongs to the same category of heretics who deny the Prophet's apostleship and obligatory functions like the *ṣalāt*, fasting, etc., because, although, this is not *per se* obligatory yet, when, its being a part of *shar'īah*, to any extent whatsoever, reaches the limit of continuous practice and due information, then to deny it is to virtually deny the apostleship of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم); otherwise, if a matter is established to have come within the ambit of the *shar'īah* by the Prophet's own practice, then why should anyone deny it? For instance, take the practice of brushing the teeth with the dentifrice known as *miswāk* (prophylactic stick of some tree.) This is by reason known to everyone as a matter of faith. Although, its being within *shar'īah* and fully proven, it reaches, by its very nature, the extent of the *sunnah* (Prophet's way), still if a person does not observe this mode of brushing teeth in his whole life, he would not have committed any sin. But if he once denies its being valid in *shar'īah* he would become an infidel.

"اجمالا فيما علم اجمالا": Observance of matters would necessarily vary. What has been described briefly should naturally be testified briefly that is to that extent. For instance, take the ordeal of the grave. Its veritability has been established through continuous successive narrations but briefly speaking, it comes only to this that the ordeal of the grave is certain. What its nature will be, has not been elaborately described by the Prophet. Hence, it is necessary to believe that this ordeal would be faced by those who deserve it. It is not necessary to repose belief in the detailed nature thereof.

Whatever has been described in detail should be testified to, and believed in detail, e.g., prayers, fasting, *Ḥajj*, *Zakāt* and so on; and where there is detailed description one should testify to, and believe in all the details; by the same token, where a thing has been described fleetingly or briefly, one should subscribe to it in a like manner, e.g., it is obligatory to believe in the apostleship of all the Prophets and in their being true. Some prophets have been described in considerable detail by name, while, others have been briefly mentioned, conveying only this much about them that they were sent:

Verily, we sent messengers before thee, among them those of whom we have told thee, and some of whom we have not told thee. (Qur'ān, 40:78)

مِنْهُمْ مَّنْ قَصَصْنَا عَلَيْكَ وَمِنْهُمْ مَّنْ
لَّمْ نَقْصُصْ عَلَيْكَ ۔ سورمن، آیۃ ۷۸

The Prophets who have been mentioned in detail, shall be believed in, and testified to, in detail, and those described briefly, shall be so subscribed and testified to.

Heraclius Definitely A Non-believer

We have shown in the foregoing that the only form of testimony which counts, is that in which, one verifies a statement out of one's own intention and volition, or supports the narrator thereof, in a like manner. This means declaring the statement of its maker thereof, true and believing it as such, not merely knowing it to be so. Once this condition is laid down, those people of the Scripture and others who had made the testimony merely because the circumstances dictated them are automatically eliminated. But we have not had so far any definition of *Īmān* (faith) which shuts out all that is foreign to it. For instance, Heracliu's testimony was not merely of the haphazard type because he had made strenuous efforts and adopted all possible deliberate measures to reach the stage of assurance: He put questions to Abū Sufyān; he sent a letter to the archbishop of Byzantine and when the latter confirmed his view, then does it stand to reason that the type of testimony secured after all these measures was not volitional? If it still remains non-voluntary, then what was the purpose of these questions and volitional measures? Heraclius did not apparently deny the Prophet's apostleship after this testimony. On the other hand, he accepted actually the prophethood of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and his being true. Accordingly when he later on commented upon the answer to every question he again and again gave expression to this view with the words: "The Prophets are like this." Then he did not merely confine himself to these things but said to Abū Sufyān that the Prophet would rule over the land now underneath his feet and occupied by him. He also expressed his desire and keenness to see the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) saying that were it possible, he would go and meet him and wash his feet. He spoke frankly about the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) being a true messenger of God in such a manner that the arch-infidel Abū Sufyān could not help being moved to such an extent that he himself said: "Since then I was always sure that ultimately the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would dominate."

Heraclius even went to the extent of inviting his people to the new religion, saying: "If you want to prosper, be rightly guided, and to preserve your empire, you should swear allegiance to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar in the *Fatḥ al-Bārī* has quoted on *mursal* Ibn Isḥāq's authority which was reported by him from some scholars. According to this, Heraclius is reported to have said :

Heraclius said! Pity on you! I know for sure that he is a Messenger of God, but I am afraid of the Byzantinians for myself. Were it not so, I would have followed him.

اَنَّ هِرَقْلَ قَالَ وَيْحَكَ وَاللّٰهِ اِنِّيْ لَاَعْلَمُ
اَنَّهٗ نَبِيٌّ مُّرْسَلٌ وَّلٰكِنْ اَخَافُ الرُّوْمَ عَلٰى
نَفْسِيْ وَلَوْلَا ذٰلِكَ لَاتَّبَعْتُهٗ -

At the time of the Battle of Tabūk, Heraclius sent a letter to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in which he explicitly said that he was a Muslim. To say that Heraclius's testimony is involuntary is sheer high handedness. All the more, he never apparently denied the apostleship of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). He did not even declare him to be a false Prophet. In fact each and every word of his shows his sincerity.

But, despite all this, Heraclius's heathenism and absence of faith are certain. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself, having read his letter on the occasion of the Battle of Tabūk, said :

This enemy of God is lying: he still firmly adheres to Christianity.

كَذَبَ عَدُوُّ اللّٰهِ اِنَّهٗ لَعَلٰى نَصْرَانِيَّتِهٖ۔

An even more important example is that of the uncle of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) Abū Ṭalīb bin 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, who had, without doubt, subscribed in his heart to the Prophethood of the Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Moreover, the way in which he lavished praises on the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) till his last breath and the help rendered to him are something remarkable in history. His panegyrics in praise of the Apostle of God (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and persistent help to him are well known. In one panegyric he addresses his own clan, the Quraysh, nay all the Arabs, and says:

كَذَبْتُمْ وَبَيْتِ اللّٰهِ نُبْزٰى مُحَمَّدًا   وَلَمَّا نُقَاتِلْ حَوْلَهٗ وَنُنَاضِلُ

By the House of God, you are uttering lies. We shall be defending Muḥammad, from a ring of archers round him and shoot arrows from our quivers.

وَنُسْلِمُهُ حَتّٰى نُصَرَّعَ حَوْلَهُ   وَنَذْهَلُ عَنْ اَبْنَائِنَا وَالْحَلَائِلِ

And we shall be defending him to our last breath till we yield our lives. And, in fighting for him, we shall care naught for our wives and offspring.

The same Qaṣīdah contains the famous couplet:

وَاَبْيَضَ يُسْتَسْقَى الْغَمَامُ بِوَجْهِهٖ   ثِمَالُ الْيَتَامٰى عِصْمَةٌ لِلْاَرَامِلِ

I swear by that effulgent face which lends lustre even to the nimbus,
he is the refuge of the orphans and the shelter for the widows.

In still another Qasīdah he says:

وَاللّٰهِ لَنْ يَصِلُوْا اِلَيْكَ بِجَمْعِهِمْ   حَتّٰى اُوَسَّدَ بِالتُّرَابِ دَفِيْنًا

By God, even when all of them combine with each other, they cannot
hope to reach him till I leave (the world) to inhabit the grave.

In view of all these statements, it would be unjust to compare this testimony with the compulsive testimony of the people of the Scripture. Abū Ṭālib never disbelieved in the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). On the contrary, verses like the following are ascribed to him:

وَدَعَوْتَنِيْ وَعَلِمْتُ اَنَّكَ صَادِقٌ   وَلَقَدْ صَدَقْتَ وَكُنْتَ قَبْلُ اَمِيْنًا ـ

And he invited me towards Islam and I know for sure he is true and whatever
he has said bears the stamp of truth and from the very beginning he is trustee.

وَعَرَفْتُ دِيْنَكَ لَا مُحَالَةَ اَنَّهٗ   مِنْ خَيْرِ اَدْيَانِ الْبَرِيَّةِ دِيْنًا

And I have recognised his religion which is
indeed the best of all religions of the world.

The Interpretation of *Īmān* According to Razi and Ghazali

Now both Heraclius and Abū Ṭālib bin ʻAbd al-Muṭṭalib had the stance of volitional testimony and never belied the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) openly.

Despite all this, their being non-believers shows that something more is essential for *īmān* in addition to testimony which was lacking in both of them. What was this? Scholars have expatiated on this point but the net result is the same. The difference lies only in the nature of the interpretation. According to Imām Rāzī and Imām Ghazālī, *īmān* is not merely cognitive knowledge and testimony: for, the former should be taken in the sense of testimony which carries weight in faith along with articulation and that inner profession which arises in the heart of a person. In other words faith is not cognitive but a matter of the heart. Whatever a man says with his tongue should spring from his heart. In short there should be affirmation with heart just like that with the tongue. This interpretation is, however, not so clear.

Interpretation by Ibn Humam, Ibn Taymiyah, and Abu Talib Makki

The best interpretation is that of Ibn Humām. He holds *īmān* to be a blend of cognitive knowledge, testimony, surrender of the heart and intellectual obedience; that is to say, the believer should surrender himself entirely like the horse or the camel and should be guided by the person who holds the bridle. A believer is one who surrenders himself to the Prophet's commands after knowing and recognising him, both outwardly and inwardly. He should move in the direction the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) commands him to move. It is this mental surrender and subservience of the heart which Imām Ibn Taymīyah considers the quintessence of devotion and Shaykh Abū Ṭālib Makkī considers it the *shar'īah*. Both have quoted the *ijmā'* (consensus) in support of their contention to the effect that it is incumbent upon every *mawmin* that he should impose upon himself the condition of subservience and obedience which must be from the innermost core of his heart. In fact, this is the real object of sending the prophets and messengers, that is all should make it incumbent upon themselves to obey the Prophet and be subservient to him. God says:—

We sent no messenger save that he should be obeyed by Allāh's leave.
(Qur'ān, 6:64)

وَمَآ اَرۡسَلۡنَا مِنۡ رَّسُوۡلٍ اِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ
بِاِذۡنِ اللّٰهِؕ (النساء، آیت ۶۴)

The ultimate obedience belongs to Allāh, and through His Command alone, does the obedience of the prophets arise. The whole section in which this *āyah* occurs is concerned with the behest of obeying these prophets. This is why all prophets enjoined the worship and testimony of God and the hypocrites have been given the title of liars inspite of their ostensible affirmation : "We bear witness that you are indeed the Apostle of God", because surrender of the inner self and obedience are something internal and testimony with the tongue is an external emblem thereof. The meaning of "نشهد انک لرسول الله" should be that, those so testifying, observe obedience to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and profess both openly and from the core of their hearts. The hypocrites were, however, in reality, false in this respect; their hearts were full of wickedness. Under such circumstances, there could be no obedience at all. Thus among the hypocrites there was a clear disparity between what they professed and did. This very subservience called 'surrender of the self and following by the heart' by Shaykh Ibn Humām and necessary obedience, by Imām Ibn Taymīyah, who has quoted in its support consensus of the community which is called submission, by Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn al-Harwī. The difference lies only in interpretation because of which, the author of the *Sharḥ-e Wiqāyah*, has ridiculed him so much so that he became known as "Master of Submission," although he only said what Ibn Humām had said and in support whereof, Ibn Taymīyah cited the consensus of the community. The difference is only that of interpretation, not in the meaning; in fact, the interpretation of Shaykh al-Harwī is closer to the Qur'ānic purport. The Qur'ān has employed the word *taslīman* wherever it has alluded to this subject:

But nay, by the Lord, they will not believe (in truth) until they make thee judge of what is in dispute between them and find within themselves no dislike of that which thou decidest, and submit with full submission. (Qur'ān, 4:65)

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤۡمِنُوۡنَ حَتّٰى يُحَكِّمُوۡكَ
فِيۡمَا شَجَرَ بَيۡنَهُمۡ ثُمَّ لَا يَجِدُوۡا فِىۡۤ اَنۡفُسِهِمۡ
حَرَجًا مِّمَّا قَضَيۡتَ وَيُسَلِّمُوۡا تَسۡلِيۡمًا۔ (النساء، آیت ۶۵)

In short, in the testimony which is recognised in faith, there is still another thing needed for its definition even after it is called the necessity of submission or obedience, surrender of the inner self or inward submission, mental speech or voice of the heart. In both, Heraclius and Abū Ṭālib we find voluntary testimony without any proof of their having belied the message of the Apostle of God (صلی الله علیه وسلم) but in both of them this vital component was absent.

Heraclius and the Negus Differentiated

This point presents itself all the more when we compare Najāshī (Negus), the King of Abbyssinia or Ethiopia and Heraclius. The latter initiated his own train of investigations and, having confirmed the signs of the Prophethood of the Messenger of God, asserted his belief in it, but in the end offered as his excuse the fear that his people would revolt. The Negus also did not come out openly with the profession of his faith. In fact, there are many who hide their faith because of fear of harm, as was the case with the Believer in the incident relating to Prophet Mūsā (علیه السلام) and described by God the Almighty Himself:

وَقَالَ رَجُلٌ مُّؤْمِنٌ قصلے مِّنْ اٰلِ فِرْعَوْنَ
یَكْتُمُ اِیْمَانَهٗ (المؤمن آیت ۲۸)

> And a believing man of Pharaoh's family, who hid his faith, said......
> (Qur'ān, 11:28)

Despite this, the Negus is a believer, but not Heraclius. The difference between the two is that the Negus, despite the fact that he did not promulgate or proclaim Islam, had accepted in his heart resignation to the creed of Islam and subservience thereto, which constitutes real faith. Heraclius, on the other hand, did not accept resignation and subservience and he also said : "ولولا ذالک (آی خوف الروم) لاتبعته" "If it were not for the fear of the Byzantines I would have followed him." This shows that Heraclius did not follow the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم), owing to lust for wealth and empire and fear of losing them. Thus he failed to accomplish total surrender and submission.

Similarly, Abū Ṭālib had everything but subservience and submission with the heart, and soul. This is why, in the last moments of his life, he admitted in his following verse :

لَوْلَآ اَنْ تُعَیِّرَنِیْ قُرَیْشٌ یَقُوْلُوْنَ اِنَّمَا
حَمَلَهٗ عَلٰی ذٰلِكَ الْجَزَعُ لَاَقْرَرْتُ بِهَا عَیْنَكَ ،
(رواہ مسلم)

> If I had not the fear of the Qureish who would have taunted me that I had become a Muslim out of fear, I would have undoubtedly testified to the truthfulness of the faith in front of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).

The same matter appears in his following verse:

لَوْلَا الْمَلَامَةُ اَوْ حَذَارُ مَسَبَّةٍ   لَوَجَدْتَنِیْ سَمْحًا بِذَاكَ مُبِیْنًا

> Had I not been afraid of the censure and reproaches of the community, he (the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) would have found me most open-hearted and frank in the acceptance of his message.

Those who have said that Abū Ṭālib was not a believer because he did not testify to the creed of Islam verbally, are not right, since there is no proof that Abū Ṭālib ever gave a lie to the Apostleship of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and whatever of his verses have been preserved apparently bespeak testimony and affirmation. For the rest, to raise the point that if Abū Ṭālib had not denied the acceptance of Islam, why should the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) have said when he (Abū Ṭālib) was breathing his last: say: "there is no God but Allāh?" This was but the formal mode of surrender of the heart and the observance of subservience which is something mental and subjective.

Surrender: A Condition or part of Faith

The point, whether this resignation of the heart, this surrender of the core of the self, or this obedience is a pre-condition of faith or only a part of it is a debatable matter. Some incline towards the view that it is a part of the faith just as testimony is, whereas others hold it to be a pre-condition. What must, however, be borne in mind is that obedience and subservience are necessary for being true to faith, but whether one can act according to it all the time is a different matter. That is to say, it is not necessary if one professing the faith falls short of the demands poised by it or commits an evil deed, that his faith would be lost. He would, however, deserve punishment. The difference between the two is only that of a criminal and a rebel.

Verbal Affirmation

Verbal affirmation or testimony stands annulled if any one does not take recourse to it either because he is under some compulsion or is dumb, or did not have the time to affirm verbally his faith because death overtook him immediately after testimony. It is universally acknowledged that he is perfect in faith even without verbal affirmation. Any one who insists on not affirming, without any restraint being placed upon him and desists from doing so, even on insistence, is without doubt, an infidel. Both these possibilities are accidental. Difference of opinion arises only when there is no restraint upon someone and none asks him to affirm so that he remains without affirmation. The question is about the verdict in such a case.

Scholastics (*mutakallimeen*) and Verbal Affirmation

Scholastics (*mutakallimeen*) hold the view that verbal affirmation is not a cardinal factor and constituent but is a pre-condition for the implementation of the commands of faith, and, in the event of the affirmation of the faith being insisted upon, he who persists in refraining from verbal affirmation, would be an infidel, as the insistence points to absence of affirmation on his part, not because affirmation *per se* is a part of the faith. This is the statement of al-Ash'arī according to the most veracious reporters. Abū Manṣūr Māturīdī as reported by Ḥāfiẓ al-Dīn al-Nasafī in the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*.

Jurists and Verbal affirmation

Jurists, on the other hand, subscribe to the view that verbal affirmation is a regular part and rudiment of the faith but it is such an essential which becomes inoperative in cases of physical incapacity, disabling circumstances and lack of time, as stated by Fakhr al-Islām in the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*.

Two statements in this behalf have been attributed to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. One is like that of the scholastics (*mutakallimeen*) as reported by Ḥāfiẓ al-Dīn al-Nasafī from Abū Ḥanīfah.

The second is in the manner of jurists as explained by 'Allāmah Tuftāzānī in the *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid*. The definition of faith by Ṭaḥawi reported from Abū Ḥanīfah, is also to the same effect.

It should also be borne in mind that, if affirmation is for the implementation of commandments of faith, this would mean it should be done publicly so that the judges and administrators should become apprised of it; it will not be sufficient to affirm faith in private. If not, it would not be possible to pass juridical orders.

Those who have not made affirmation part and parcel of the faith apparently agree on the basis of that *ḥadīth* which says: “فمن كان فى قلبه مثقال حبة من خردل من ايمان فاخرجه منها” “This indicates that faith is in the heart and has nothing to do with the tongue.”

اَلْمَذَاهِبُ فِي حَقِيقَةِ الْإِيمَانِ

THE DEFINITIONS OF *IMAN* IN DIFFERENT SECTS

Those who follow Jahm bin Safwān believe that faith means profound cognition whether volitional or non-volitional, so much so that after acquiring this cognition, in whatever way his faith remains perfect, whatever he might say or do thereafter. His faith is like that of the prophets and the *siddiqs* so long as this cognition remains. This view is absolutely false. The type of cognition was possessed even by the People of the Scripture and the Pharaoh. As regards Heraclius, it is all too evident, although his heathenism stands proved from the Qur'ān.

The Karramiyah

The Karrāmiyah are the followers of Muḥammad bin Karrām. They believe that *īmān* is synonymous with verbal affirmation. One wonders why they merely harp upon verbal affirmation instead of testimony and action. Whereas even the Hypocrites who affirmed and acted in conformity with what they professed verbally, are nevertheless heretics as proved by the text of the Qur'ān.

When expositions and elucidations of this sect were closely examined, it was disclosed that they regarded mere verbal affirmation as the essence of faith; that is to say, only he who affirms would be liable to the application of the laws of the Qur'ān. If there is corresponding testification in heart as well, his faith will prove worthy of reliance in the next world evevn; if the heart does not synchronize with what the tongue says, only the rulings of faith will operate on him in mundane affairs. In the next world, however, he would be "in the lowest deep of the fire" (Qur'ān, 4-145) just like the hypocrites. Thereafter, there is not much difference left with those who profess Islam, and recompense is also the same as that maintained by them.

The Murjiah

This sect claims that voluntary attestation and verbal affirmation constitute the faith. The commission of sins and vices does not affect faith. Its adherents neither consider faith to be non-volitional cognition like the Jahmia nor mere verbal affirmation like the Karramiyah. But they have brought down actions to such a low level that, even if a man is wholly lost in the commission of prohibited acts, major sins and vices, after affirmation and testification, these will not cause him the least harm, nor will he be consigned to hell even for a single moment just as a heathen, for all the good deeds he performs all his life, will not for an instant, enter Paradise. It is unanimously agreed that Paradise is wholly closed to such a person. Similarly, hell is closed to the Believer even if he is wholly lost in sin. Just as no worship is of any use in heresy, similarly is the case with faith; no evil-doing can cause it any harm.

To my mind, probably they think there will be different grades or stations, high or low, in Paradise according to our good or bad deeds. Those who stand out because of their good deeds will occupy a high place in Paradise, whereas those who have committed evil deeds will inhabit the inferior stations. If the adherents of this sect fail to believe in this distinction even, then its view is wholly contrary to reason, because, if our acts are not going to influence us at all then what was the use of all these elaborate arrangements, the Prophets and Scriptures giving detailed lists of deeds and orders? It was all futile; neither the good deeds serve any useful purpose nor are evil deeds harmful. Even a dunce cannot avert such a thesis.

The Mutazilites and the Kharijites

As against the Murjites, the Mutazilites and the Kharijites claim that one's acts are also an integral part of one's faith. And they are linked to faith to such an extent that, even if by chance, some obligation is not fulfilled or some prohibited act is committed by someone, he will lose his faith. Some Mutazilites take this to apply to all sorts of commandments and prohibitions, even the agreeable and repugnant acts. But as the *Sharḥ-e Maqāṣid* says, this is too extreme a view.

There is, again, difference between the Mutazilites and the Kharijites on this issue. According to the former, even though, such a person would neither be a Believer, nor he would be an infidel, he would be regarded as an evil-liver, though not an evil-liver, as generally understood according to the *shar'īah*. He is put in-between the Believers and infidels, neither this nor that in the operation of religion, orders and denomination. On the Day of Judgement, however, he would eternally abide in Hell. In the *shar'īah*, an evil-liver is a Believer though he is doomed to eternal damnation in Hell. He will be sent to Paradise in the very beginning or after undergoing punishment according to his misdeeds.

The various notions prevalent among the Khārijites have been taken from works by Sunnite theologians. No work by a Khārijite has been seen to this day. Even a person of so extensive purview as Ibn Taymīyah says that he has not come across a single Khārijite work. According to both these sects, the Mutazilites and the Khārijites, one who commits a major sin is destined for eternal abode in hell. There is only a slight difference between the two as regards the application of the word *kāfir* (infidel). The Murjites are very lax, and do not consider evil-doing deleterious at all; whilst the other two are extremists to this extent that they consider deeds all important so far so that even if a single deed is missed, a person would lose his faith just like the man who does not testify would abide in hell for ever. Both these sects are extremists. The Sunnites steer a middle course, and though, there are some differences among them, yet they all agree that the Mutazilite, Khārijite, and Murjite creeds are false. None among the Sunnites holds them to be right.

The Sunnite creed

The unanimous view of all the Sunnites is that, expressed by Ibn Tamiyah, that is so long as affirmation and testification are there and an act is committed which nullifies the attestation, e.g., genuflection before idols, throwing the Qur'ān in foul matter, abusing the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and so on. The Sunnites are unanimously holding that a person guilty of such odious acts automatically becomes an infidel, not because of these acts *per se* but because they bespeak, both mentally and generaly, the absence of attestation.

Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal counts the renunciation of prayers also among such acts. Hence, he who abandons prayers loses his faith. If he does not repent, he would become an apostate, condemnable to execution because the giving up of prayers is a sign of absence of attestation just like prostrating before an idol. But everyone knows this very well that the commitment of major sins does not amount to the disapperance of attestation. There is a distinct difference between a son who is disobedient to his parents, e.g., in the commitment of an act against the behest of his father, and the son who shows his disobedience by beating his father with a shoe. Both these acts are indicative of disobedience, but the former does not show that he does not have any respect for his father, whereas the other speaks for itself. Any one claiming reverence for a man's father in such a case would be regarded as senseless. Thus, just as every act does not mean reverence, similarly nor every sin, minor or major, negates testification. Denying this fact would be sheer obstinacy and denial of something, both explicitly and implicitly.

Nor do the Sunnites hold every sin to be free from deleterious effects. On the other hand, they maintain that, if a sin is not forgiven, the person committing it will be deserving of punishment in hell, though such a damnation shall not be eternal. The sinner having fulfilled the tenure of his punishment shall certainly go to Paradise. In sum, the sinner shall go to hell but for a limited duration. The Sunnite creed therefore does not conform to that of the Mutazilites and the Kharijites nor has it anything to do with that of the Murjites. And this is surely the right course.

To this extent all the Sunnites are unanimous and this is the basic belief of all its component sects. Subsequently, some differences arose in interpretation. The interpretation of some is close to that of Kharijites. That is their wording is apparently similar, while that of the others is near that of the Murjites though only in form. Hence the *muḥaddithīn* say: "الایمان قول وعمل یا الایمان معرفة بالقلب واقرار باللسان وعمل بالارکان"

Faith consists of word and deed, or it means affirmation by the tongue and acting according to basic principles. Hence when faith is considered a compound of these three ingredients, it apparently resembles the view of Kharijites and Mutazilites. But there is difference between the significance and purport because the *muḥaddithīn* further say that unlike testification action is not such an ingredient that one who abandons it would become a heretic or fall outside the pale of faith. Similarly, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, his Sheikh, Hamād, and most of the scholastics whether Asharites or Maturidites, define faith by means of affirmation and attestation, and do not regard conduct as a part thereof.

This enunciation of theirs, though, apparently resembling that of the Murjites, is far apart in purport. The Murjites do not consider sin deleterious at all and do not think those who commit major sins as deserving punishment in hell even for a single moment. The Hanafites and others of the right stance, on the contrary, subscribe to the view that such sinners deserve to be sent to hell though they would not remain there for ever.

This shows that there is real difference between the people of the *sunnah* and the deviated sects. The difference *inter se* of the Sunnite schools relates only to interpretation—merely verbal or at the most slightly ideological which does not warrant contrary juridical decrees or inferences. Of the many unjust excesses committed upon the Hanafite sect, one of the most deplorable facts is that merely because of this interpretation Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and his school have been included in the list of Murjites. If merely on the basis of this interpretation, the Hanafites are counted amongst the Murjites as has been actually done by Ibn Qutaybah and others, why the *Muḥaddithīn* also are not included amongst the Kharijites and Mutazalites. When they are themselves involved in such a situation, they promptly contend that their views are not those of Mutazilites and Kharijites and to prove this they employ all sorts of interpretations and explanations. But, in the case of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, all his interpretations and expositions are misrepresented and he is dubbed as a Murjite. They do not consider it even necessary to go into the meaning and significance of what the Imām said. Although some people have brushed aside justice altogether, they have at least taken a lenient view of *Irja*. For instance, 'Abd al-Kaīrm Shahrastānī, the author of Al-Milal wa al-Nahal and Ibn Taymīyah, in his treatise al Imān has said that *irja* is of two kinds. One is spoken in reference to the Murjite sect which has deviated from the right path and are condemned to perdition; the other is not like it (and not as condemnable). Nevertheless, whatever be the connotation attached to the expression *irja*, good or bad, we the Hanafites, abstain from being associated therewith.

The Tamīyyah and others have not fully expounded the meaning of "irja", hence we propose to discuss it in some detail so that their implication may be brought out.[1]

Refutation of a doubt concerning Imam Abu Hanifah

So a great injustice has been done to the sect of Hanafites that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah has been called "Murjite", merely on the basis of words and interpretations. Similarly, one more injustice has been done to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. A sentence is ascribed to him namely: "الا يمان هو المعرفة" (Faith is cognition.) Taking the literal meaning of the word *m'arifat* occurring therein, the critics have declared Imām Abū Ḥanīfah a Jahmiyite.

This is inspite of the fact that a disputation took place between Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and Jahm bin Sufwān, the leader of the Jahmiyites, and it is also reported that the Imām publicly declared him to be an infidel, saying, "قم عنى يا كافر" "You heretic! go out of my sight." Imām Abū Ḥanīfah was very scrupulous and hesitant in declaring anyone *kāfir* (infidel). But, besides declaration of infidelity against *Jahm*, we have the authority of Imām Ṭaḥāwī who is the most authoritative exponent of the Hanafite creed. The definition of faith which he has reported from Imām Abū Ḥanīfah contains testimony by the heart instead of *m'arifat* or cognition. It is really deplorable that merely on the basis of the word cognition, without ascertaining its meaning, the Imām was declared Jahmiyite. If any one else had used the word *m'arifat*, these people would have taken to interpret all kinds of exegesis and significance. The word *m'arifat* (cognition) is reported even from Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal and Ḥaḍrat 'Alī ibn Tālib. In fact, this word *m'arifat* occurs in the definition of faith by all the *salaf* (ancestors). Shaykh 'Abd al-Qāsim Anṣārī, the Shaykh of 'Abd al-Karīm Shahrastānī, in his commentary of Imām al-Ḥarmany's al-Irshād has reported the statement of the earlier writers according to which, faith consists of cognition by the heart, affirmation by the tongue, and observance of the prime rites of the faith. Nobody raises any objection to this and everyone sets himself to explain it, saying, it means testimony. The expression has a wider significance and the one applies to the other. But where this very word is used by Abū Ḥanīfah, all the doors of interpretation are closed. He is given no latitude whatsoever and is frequently given a short shift, although there is every evidence to show that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah does not interpret the word, *m'arifat*, in its apparent and literal sense, because the Imām had a disputation with the sect which defined *m'arifat* as "faith", and he therefore called it heretic. How in the face of such evidence, could the Imām be held responsible to equate *m'arifat* with *īmān*, especially when the word attestation has also been attributed to him in conjunction with the word, *īmān*? But alas! all these concrete pieces of evidence are ignored.

---

[1] Please see for further explanation of Irja on page 248 upto the portion before the heading, Reconciliation to the doubt about Abū Imām Ḥanīfah on page 250 of Faḍl al-Bārī.

In the same way, Imām Bukhārī has reproduced the statement of Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin Mas'ud: "اليقين الايمان كله" (Belief is almost faith). Belief is both voluntary and non-voluntary. So when Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin Mas'ud calls such belief complete faith, recourse to interpretation is taken and no objection is raised. What is the fault of the Imām that interpretation should be considered taboo in his case although there is ample scope for that. How strange and what a calamity!

The best interpretation of the Imām's statement is that by *m'arifat* he means attestation by heart which is a prerequisite in faith. This is the very word which Ṭaḥāwī has ascribed to the Imām. There is scope in usage to associate one word with the other because attestation can take place only after realisation or *m'arifat*. How can there be any attestation without knowledge or realisation or *m'arifat*.

As for faith being cognition, "الايمان هو المعرفة" although verbal affirmation is also essential, the Imām has also said in one of his statements that verbal affirmation is not a necessary adjunct to faith. If the second statement is taken up, then the intended purpose is to cover its importance as a vital component because the real root and cardinal constituent is attestation only, which, once expressed with the tongue, becomes acknowledgement. The coverage here is the same as in the case of the statement "الحج عرفة" (*Ḥajj* is but *arfa*). Now *Ṭawāf-e-Ziyārat* (the going round the Holy Ka'bah or the first institution), is obligatory; so the statement signifies something by stressing its importance, a part being made to stand for the whole.

We know the example of Muḥammad Ibn Ḥibbān (died 354 A.H.) who said: "النبوة العلم والعمل" "Prophethood is the name of knowledge and deeds" which plunged him into trouble. He was called a zindīq and the reigning Caliph ordered his execution. Some eminent *Muḥaddithīn* also joined in the crusade against him, calling him a philosopher, for philosophers believe that prophethood is something that can be acquired through assiduous application to knowledge and practice. But in all fairness, it must be said that Ibn Ḥibbān did not deviate from true belief, for what he actually meant was not that prophethood was something acquired but it required a sentient spirit which has a marked aptitude for mastering maximum knowledge and action. Thereafter, a person is anointed with prophethood, intuitively. As the Qur'ān says, "الله يعلم حيث يجعل رسالته" (Allāh knoweth best with whom to place his message.) (6:124). Hence Zahbi has said in his book, *Tazkirat al-huffaz*. "هذاله محمل حسن ولم يرد حصر المبتدأ فى الخبر ومثله الحج عرفة فمعلوم ان الرجل لا يصير حاجا بمجرد الوقوف بعرفة وانما ذكر مهم الحج"

The second interpretation is that here *m'arifat* does not mean the general cognition upon which faith depends but the the spiritual insight of the Sufis which enhances faith by strenuous exercises and austere discipline and makes man immune from the commission of sinful acts, inclining him towards good deeds. Such a person is called "arif". The word, *m'arifat*, has a third meaning too, opposed to the imitative faith, that is the faith arising from deliberation and ratiocination and not falling into the footsteps of the elders.

Faith based on '*Taqlīd*'

The point whether the faith accepted as a matter of "*Taqlīd*" i.e. following prescribed rites and belief is the proper faith or not is a matter of controversy. The Mutazilites believe that proper faith is not possible unless profound insight is gained by ratiocination. Some have ascribed this view to Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī but it is not correct, because the major Ash'arītes have refuted it so far so that Imām Abū al-Qāsim Qushayrī declared that such a statement was not worthy of Imām Ash'ari. All the Sunnite juristic schools are agreed upon that the faith based on tradition is proper faith because we all know that a great man performing good deeds inspires and convinces people of less understanding. Hence such faith must be reckonable. There is no doubt, however, that if one's faith is not merely of unquestioned acceptance but is based upon enlightened ratiocination, it would have precedence over the other. It is possible that it is the second type of faith that is meant herein.

Shaykh Abdul Qadir Jilani on the Hanafites

Ḥaḍrat Shaykh Ghawth 'Abd al-Qādir Jīlānī, while describing the deviated sects has, in his work, Ghunīyyat al-Ṭālibīn mentioned the Qadrīyah (Determinists) also and has included the Hanafites in this sect. That is to say the Hanafites are an offshoot of the Qādrīyah, which is a deviated sect.

God forbid that these words be from Ḥaḍrat Shaykh Ghawth. No one except the Prophets is free from faults. It is probable that the Shaykh Ghawth was given some wrong report embodying the Sunnite credo which led him to put down this statement. If this is not so, this statement certainly cannot be his. It is derogatory to his dignity to have come out with such a strong statement. Though he himself subscribed to the Ḥanablite school of Jurisprudence, he could not have come out with such a statement about the Hanafites. Some wicked person must have inserted the statement in his writing. (Such is the view of Al-Zubayid in his *Sharḥ fi al-Ihya.* Such interpolations have been made in the works of many a great author. 'Allāmah 'Abd al-Wahab Sha'rānī says that, during his own life, when his works were published, some ulamā accused him of being a deviate and sent copies of the passages reeking of un-Islamic statements to him. When he looked them over, he found they were not his, and had been added to the body of the text by someone else. Likewise, such interpolation in "Ghuniyyah" also seems to be of the same nature, otherwise such a wrong statement or reproduction being absolutely absurd could never have been included in "Ghuniyyah." After all, there should be some valid reason for calling the Ḥanafites, Qādrīyite, particularly because this sect is opposed to Jabriyyah. Is there any precedent in which the Hanafites have maintained the stand of the Determinists? Again, the Murjites are not the offshoot of the Qādriyite.

Sum and substance of the foregoing

The gist of the foregoing is that the members of the Sunnite belief, whether they are Hanafites or *Muḥaddithīn*, are unanimous with regard to the benefits, consequences and purport of faith; there is difference only in terminology and expression. The *Muḥaddithīn* hold "الايمان قول وعمل" that is, faith consists of word and deed, so that conduct is also a part thereof. The Hanafites, on the other hand, maintain that conduct is not a part of it; so far as the purport is concerned, the net result is the same.

Examination of the Concept of Iman by the Hanafites and the preferential arguments advanced by them

Two points, on this issue, need consideration: (i) the source of the standpoint of the Hanafites from the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth*; (ii) difference between the interpretation of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and the *salaf*. As regards the arguments, the Book of God stands uppermost. The Hanafites derive five arguments from it in support of their credo.

(i) Those Qur'ānic *āyāt* in which action is conjoined with *īmān* which means that action is other than faith inasmuch as the conjunction is here disjunctive, distinguishing the one from the other. Anything contrary to it would be contrary to the tenor of the original source and as such requires external testimonies and arguments. Moreover, if action were a part of faith, then its mentioning again would mean repetition.

The Qur'ān says :

(And) lo ! those who believe and do good works are the best of created beings. (Qur'ān, 98:7)

اِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَعَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ

(ii) Those *āyāt* in which *īmān* has been made a necessary condition for action. For instance, the Qur'ān says :

And those who have performed good deeds and are faithful. (Qur'ān, 20:112)

وَمَنْ يَّعْمَلْ مِنَ الصّٰلِحٰتِ وَهُوَ مُؤْمِنٌ

And the condition and the contingent are at variance.

(iii) Such *āyāt* as have been addressed to the believers and in which they have been commanded to repent. For instance.

O ye who believe! Turn unto Allāh in sincere repentance! (Qur'ān, 66:8)

يٰۤاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا تُوْبُوْۤا اِلَى اللّٰهِ تَوْبَةً نَّصُوْحًا (التحریم آیت ۸)

Repentance arises from the commitment of sin. If action is a part of faith, then the latter is opposed to sinfulness. But the above mode of address indicates the correctness of faith being combined with sinfulness, although nothing can combine with its contrary.

(iv) The *āyāt* in which the word, *mawmin* (Believer) has been employed for persons committing sins. For instance :

And, if two parties of believers fall to fighting, then make peace between them, And, if one party of them doeth wrong to the other, fight ye that which doeth wrong till it return unto the ordinance of Allāh ; then, if it return, make peace between them justly and act equitably. Lo! Allāh loveth the equitable. (Qur'ān, 49:9)

وَاِنْ طَآئِفَتٰنِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ اقْتَتَلُوْا
فَاَصْلِحُوْا بَيْنَهُمَا فَاِنْۢ بَغَتْ اِحْدٰىهُمَا عَلَى الْاُخْرٰى
فَقَاتِلُوا الَّتِيْ تَبْغِيْ حَتّٰى تَفِيْٓءَ اِلٰۤى اَمْرِ اللّٰهِ (حجرات ۹)

This shows that such a party was hitherto out of the bonds of God's behest. In spite of that he has been called *mawmin*.

(v) Those *āyāt* which call the heart the repository of *īmān* and faith is ascribed to the heart, e.g.,

And for such, He hath written faith upon their hearts. (Qur'ān, 54:22)

اُولٰٓئِكَ كَتَبَ فِيْ قُلُوْبِهِمُ الْاِيْمَانَ (المجادلہ آیت ۲۲)

has given rise to difference in view. How is it that, despite agreement in adjudging, there has arisen this difference in interpretation? Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan has said that in fact this difference

At another place also *īmān* has been associated with the heart:

Of such as say with their mouths: "We believe," but their hearts believe not. (Qur'ān, 5:41)	مِنَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا آمَنَّا بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَلَمْ تُؤْمِنْ قُلُوبُهُمْ (المائدہ آیت ۴۱)

After that, even *Ḥadīth* justifies it, particularly those *Aḥādīth* which refer to this kind of theme "يخرج من النار من كان في قلبه مثقال حبة من خردل من ايمان" "Every that man would be taken out of hell who would have *īmān* as much as a small particle."

Dispelling a misgiving

The *āyāt* of the fifth kind and the *Ḥadīth* apparently show *īmān* to be simply attestation so far so that even oral attestation is not a part of it. The answer is that no doubt one statement of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah is such that verbal affirmation is not the condition of *īmān*. If it is so, then we would say, since the root of *īmān* is testimony, affirmation is only its outward expression and announcement. *Īmān*, bereft of testimony, is nothing. Testimony is the real basis which can, in no case, be deleted. Verbal affirmation is something supererogatory which becomes inoperative because of some extenuating circumstance. Hence, in view of its real core, the faith has been associated with only the heart. This interpretation supports verbal affirmation of its being the part of *īmān* which is justified by arguments. Hence, whatever Qur'ānic texts would appear to have a contrary tenor, it would necessarily require special interpretation but no such interpretation would be tenable in the case of action because hitherto its being part of faith has not been established so that the Qur'ānic texts should be interpreted from this angle.

Imam Abu Hanifah and the *Ḥadīth* concerning the Angel Jibrail

The tradition that lends clear and strong support to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's stand on *īmān* is that which concerns the Angel Jibra'īl. Act has not been linked with the *ultima ratio* of *īmān* in this *ḥadīth*. It also creates another problem that there is a distinction between Islam and *īmān*, otherwise there would have been no varied questions and answers on this subject. This point needs elaborate discussion and would be taken up later on.

Arguments advanced by the *Muḥaddithīn*

The *Muḥaddithīn* also present certain *āyāt* of the Qur'ān to prove that act is a part of faith. For instance:

They only are the (true) believers whose hearts feel fear when Allāh is mentioned, and when the revelations of Allāh are recited unto them they increase their faith, and who trust in their Lord. (Qur'ān, 8:2)	إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ إِذَا ذُكِرَ اللَّهُ وَجِلَتْ قُلُوبُهُمْ وَإِذَا تُلِيَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُهُ زَادَتْهُمْ إِيمَانًا وَعَلَىٰ رَبِّهِمْ يَتَوَكَّلُونَ ۝ (انفال آیت ۲)
Only those believe in Our revelations who, when they are reminded of them, fall down prostrate and hymn the praise of their Lord, and they are not scornful. (Qur'ān, 32:15)	إِنَّمَا يُؤْمِنُ بِآيَاتِنَا الَّذِينَ إِذَا ذُكِّرُوا بِهَا خَرُّوا سُجَّدًا وَسَبَّحُوا بِحَمْدِ رَبِّهِمْ وَهُمْ لَا يَسْتَكْبِرُونَ ۩ السجدہ، آیت ۱۵

The following *āyah* is also quoted in support of the stand of the *Muḥaddithīn*:

Successful indeed are the believers,
who are humble in their prayers.
(Qur'ān, 23:1 and 2)

قَدْ اَفْلَحَ الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ ۙ الَّذِيْنَ هُمْ فِيْ
صَلَاتِهِمْ خَاشِعُوْنَ ۙ (المومنون، آیت ۱، ۲)

These *āyāt* clearly establish that fear and praise of God, resignation to and prostration before Him all are parts of faith. The word "*Innamā*" circumscribes those who are humble in their prayers, pay the *zakāt*, etc. If all these are but acts, we come to know that act is a part of faith.[1]

Imam Ghazali's dubiety on the *Muḥaddithīn's* approach

Imām Ghazālī has objected to the stand of the *Muḥaddithīn*. He asks the *Muḥaddithīn* whether a person who has not resigned himself to God's Will, has not offered his *tahajjud*, and has not been humble in his prayers, but has heartily accepted and got its testimony by verbal affirmation, will never enter Paradise. Even the *Muḥaddithīn* are agreed upon that, if such a person is not forgiven, he will certainly enter Heaven simply because of his attestation (after undergoing punishment for his misdeeds,) otherwise, it would be a sin according to the view of Kharijites and Mutazilites, whereas all the Qur'ānic *nuṣūṣ* clearly show that only the *mu'mins* and none else will be admitted to Paradise: "لا يد خل الجنة الا نفس مسلمة" (None but the righteous ones shall enter Paradise.) Thus it is proved that a man can be a *mu'min* without action. Then how can action be a part of faith?

Imam Razi and *Muḥaddithīn*

Imām Rāzī, too, being a scholastic (*Mutakallimīn*) has, in his Manāqib al-Shāfi'ī (The Virtues of Imām Shāfi'ī), criticised the *Muḥaddithīn* on this point. How is it possible, he asks, that they should hold act to be a part of faith, and yet maintain that with its association *īmān* still does not lose its existence? Although, it is one of the admitted facts that when the part is severed from its whole, the whole cannot maintain its integrity as it is composed of many components. This being a universal truth, needs no argument.

Hafiz ibn Hajar's stand: A brief discussion

Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has accepted this objection and has said that those who consider act a part of faith do not regard it as an essence of faith but a part of perfect faith. Thus when act does not exist, essence of faith itself will remain in existence and a person will enter Paradise. With the loss of perfect faith, he will not be entitled to enter Paradise. But the Hanafites also do not deny it. They have never denied act as being a part of perfect faith; they only deny that it is a part of essence of faith.

Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has called this issue simply playing with the word. But this seems to be far from reality because outstanding imāms and scholars on both sides hold different opinions and books regularly have been written on the subject and strong arguments are being advanced. How can such a controversy be called merely a game of words? Could all these Imāms and learned scholars not know that they are making the words merely a quibble?

Ibn Taymiyyah has replied Imām Rāzī's dubiety, saying that it is misguiding one self and others as well, because a composite whole has two things; one, being its composed form as a whole, and the other, its real existence in sense and spirit manifested as external configuration. No doubt, whenever a single component is missing, the composite whole loses its existence. This is what is meant by saying that the vanishing of a part means the vanishing of the whole. But the purport of our discussion is not this. What we mean is whether the reality which was being manifested hitherto, would be annihilated or would exist even with the loss of one component. This point is worth some discussion, as the annihilation of a component does not necessarily mean the annihilation of the complete whole. There are several parts and their disappearance does not adversely affect the existence of the whole. A tree, for example, is an organism having many components—the root, the trunk, leaves, boughs, fruits and flowers. But the leaves, flowers and fruits are the parts and their destruction would not vitiate the existence of the whole tree so long as the trunk and the root are there. Of course, if the root is uprooted, there shall be no existence of the tree. The same analogy might be applied to man. The body of a man consists of multiple organs, e.g., eyes, ears, hands, feet, etc., their destruction, no doubt, will affect the organism of man but he will not lose his existence as a man. But, if his head is cut off, he will lose his existence. Thus the point to be noted is that there are two kinds of components (1) essential, and (2) non-essential. The essential components are those, the annihilation of which will result in the total annihilation of a being, while the non-essential components do not affect the very existence of any whole; if they are separated from it, although its existence is there, it is altered, deformed, or vitiated. Applying this analogy to *īmān*, we might say that there are two kinds of components of *Īmān*; one essentially vital component is attestation and if it is abstracted from *Īmān*, it annihilates *īmān*. The second component is non-essential, pertaining to such acts the absence of which will not annihilate the essence of faith, but the person so characterised will not be called the *mu'min* absolute but a *mu'min* of vitiated faith. If the latter is still classified with the *mu'min* absolute, then the *mu'min* absolute will exist no more.

---

[1] For *Mu'min* absolute and absolute *Mu'min* see the philosophical viewpoint of Ibn Taymiyyah on page. 254 *Faḍl al-Bārī*.

Thus although the Hanafites and *Muḥaddithīn* are unanimous on the point of difference, in respect of inferences and purpose, it cannot be called merely verbal. It is in fact a difference of viewpoint although both have the same purpose. We shall indicate this difference later on.

Nature of difference in the interpretations of Faith

We would now discuss how much difference there is between Hanafites and *salaf* in respect of their viewpoint and how far the former have departed from the views of their *salaf*, incurring blame and reproach. Let us first ascertain what actual view *salaf* have in this regard. Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir Baghdādī in his book, al-Asmā' wal *Ṣifāt* (Names and Attributes) and the Shaykh of Shahrastānī, Shaykh Abū al-Qāsim Anṣārī, in *Sharḥ Irshād* have reproduced the statement of the *salaf*. Both of them are absolutely reliable and have reproduced in full the original text, which is as follows:

Īmān is the name of the knowledge attained by the inner self, verbal affirmation, and observance of cardinal rites; it increases with submission and falls with disobedience.

اَلْإِيْمَانُ مَعْرِفَةٌ بِالْقَلْبِ وَإِقْرَارٌ بِاللِّسَانِ
وَعَمَلٌ بِالْأَرْكَانِ يَزِيْدُ بِالطَّاعَةِ وَيَنْقُصُ
بِالْمَعْصِيَةِ۔

This has been abridged by others. For instance, Imām Bukhārī has said that *īmān* is a composite of word and deed, where saying is something general—whether it be an inward affirmation signified by *ma'rifat*, or verbal affirmation and deed can also be generalised to include both inward and outward aspects. Whatever might be the case, our aim is to show that early Muslims did not say that *īmān* is a compound of which act is a part. Yet there is a reference to a single statement from them admitting of several doubts in its explanation. One of them is that all the foregoing things may be but parts and the other is that all of them may not be the parts but some of them might be parts while others are the additional attributes. This is so in common usage as, for example, in a *ḥadīth* in Tirmidhī Sharīf (Chapter on Humility in Prayer) which runs as follows:

Faḍl ibn 'Abbās has said that the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said, "The prayer consists of two *rak'āt*, with each *rak'ah* having two *al-Taḥiyāts*[1] and that the prayer should be accompanied by humility, surrender and submissiveness. Then thou raise both thy hands." The narrator says, "Raising of the hands means raising them upwards in such a way that the palms of the hands should be towards thy face and thou shouldst say, "O God! he who does not conform to this would not be offering a proper prayer "

وَعَنْ فَضْلِ بْنِ عَبَّاسٍ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ
صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اَلصَّلٰوةُ مَثْنٰى مَثْنٰى تَشَهُّدٌ
فِيْ كُلِّ رَكْعَتَيْنِ وَتَخَشُّعٌ وَتَضَرُّعٌ وَتَمَسْكُنٌ ثُمَّ
تُقْنِعُ يَدَيْكَ يَقُوْلُ تَرْفَعُهُمَا اِلٰى رَبِّكَ مُسْتَقْبِلًا
بِبُطُوْنِهِمَا وَجْهَكَ وَتَقُوْلُ يَارَبِّ يَارَبِّ وَمَنْ
لَّمْ يَفْعَلْ ذٰلِكَ فَهُوَ كَذَا وَكَذَا ؞

The prayer is a composite whole, wherein are embodied several things as set forth in the above *ḥadīth*. No one can declare that all that has been described in it is an essential part of the prayer. In fact, some of these things are not contained in the prayer; they are extraneous to it, and are in the nature of additional attributes. For instance, practice does not form part of the whole but is only an accessory thereof, but in order to highlight its importance this feature is particularly affixed to it, as in the following *ḥadīth*: "الحج العج والثج" "To come again and again for the circumambulation of the House of God, tripping saying "I have come; I have come"; shedding tears.

Another *Ḥadīth* reads: "الحج عرفة" "*Ḥajj* is but '*Arafah*," that is the essence of *Ḥajj* lies in '*Arafah*, a vital phase in the stage of the *Ḥajj*. Here '*Arafah* has been equated with the *Ḥajj* because of its being a major component thereof. The same is the case with " '*ajj*" and "*thajj*" although both these are not essential parts of the *Ḥajj* but are only its accessories and additional attributes. The main components of the *Ḥajj* are only three.

The aim of all this elucidation is to show that at times the mode of expression is such that several aspects are associated with a thing, although they do not form part of it. But the association of that thing with these ancillary or extraneous features does not mean that they constitute its integral parts, as is evident from the above *ḥadīth* due to Haḍrat Faḍl bin 'Abbās and from other instances. Once we have grasped this point, we cannot infer from the above statement of the *salaf* (ancestors) that all aspects described under the heading of faith constitute parts of faith for them. We cannot infer this definitely from it nor categorically set it down to this. We can only say that if it is liable to this interpretation, it is as well liable to the other interpretation that is they do not all form parts of it. In fact, some are parts while others are ancillaries and adjustments. From the point of view, the mode and usage of language, both the interpretations are possible. Then, we can confidently claim that nowhere does a statement of the *salaf* (ancestors) exist to show that practice forms part and parcel of faith. Whatever has come down from *salaf* (ancestors) on the subject is the above-quoted statement. And we have shown that it is capable of two interpretations. So every one is free to choose any interpretation he likes. The *Muḥaddithīn* considered all the three factors—inner knowledge attestation, verbal affirmation and observance of the cardinal rites of faith—as parts of faith. The act is not a part but an ancillary aspect of faith. So why all this hue and cry that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah has committed an innovation and has gone against the *salaf* (ancestors)? How so? When have the *salaf* (ancestors) said that the deed is a part of faith? If he (Abū Ḥanīfah) has departed from the interpretation of the *Muḥaddithīn*, what wrong has he committed? It is not incumbent upon Imām Abū Ḥanīfah to follow what the "*Muḥaddithīn*" understood by it. Just as the latter have accepted one alternative, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah has accepted the other. Both alternative interpretations are possible in respect of the statement of *salaf*. Thus Imām Abū Ḥanīfah has but analysed the statement of the *salaf* (ancestors). For instance, a reporter has given complete description of the prayer offered by the Holy Prophet (صلی الله عیه وسلم) in delineating the attributes of the prayer. Later on, the jurists analysed this and indicated which parts of it were obligatory, incumbent, optional and so on. In short, what Imām Abū Ḥanīfah has said about deeds not being a part of faith conforms to the Qur'ānic text, the *Ḥadīth*, and what the *salaf* (ancestors) have said. It is not in contrary to any of these in the least.

---

[1] That is, salutations.

Standpoints of the *Muḥaddithīn* and Imam Abu Hanifah: An Illustration

As already explained in detail, there is virtually no difference between the dictum of *Muḥaddithīn* and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. It is a difference of approach and not quibbling with words. Let us illustrate it with an example. A tree has boughs and a trunk from which these boughs sprout and bulge out. Both these are parts of the entity of the tree and the relationship of these organs to the tree is partial. These boughs bear relation to the tree which is the relation of part to the whole. These bear relation to the trunk and roots as well which is not a relation of parts to the whole but parts to parts. However, it should be borne in mind that all the ancillaries and auxiliaries do not possess the same status. They have different shootings. The branches and leaves, flowers and fruits are all adjustments of the tree but they do not possess the same status. According to the *Muḥaddithīn*, the relation of the deeds to faith is just like that of the boughs to the essence of the tree. On the other hand, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah is of the view that the relationship of deeds with belief is like that of the boughs to the trunk and roots.

A Tradition of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) also points to this: "الایمان بضع وسبعون شعبه" "that is, from one aspect of belief the other derives strength and stimulation." Hence stronger the roots and larger the trunk, the stronger and the sturdier will be the boughs. Exactly in the same way, the larger and the sturdier the branches, the stronger will be the roots and larger the trunk. Similarly, the stronger and more developed the belief, the more will the actions improve and expand. Likewise, the more advanced the deeds, the stronger and more developed will be the belief, with the result that the inner sight and enlightenment will increase. This fact can be observed in men of faith.

Cause of divergence in interpretation: Mawlana Mahmud al-Hasan's view

As already stated, there is no difference between both the parties in respect of a judgement; the difference lies only in interpretation which has given rise to difference in view. How is it that, despite agreement in adjudging, there has arisen this difference in interpretation? Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan has said that in fact this difference and contention had its roots in the theological setting of that time. The *Muḥaddithīn* had to contend with the Murjites who degrade deed to such an extent that action loses entire point of contact with faith. The commitment of thousands of sins and evil deeds (according to them) cause not the least harm to faith. Consequently, the *Muḥaddithīn* came forth to attack this approach on the part of the Murjites who had relegated practice to such a low pedestal of accountability and their rejoinder boiled up to this that observance (or practice) is a part of belief and constitutes its integral part. They (the *Muḥaddithīn*) rebuked them (the *Murjites*) for contending that practice was not part of faith and that it had no connection whatsoever therewith. They (the *Muḥaddithīn*) considered this a piece of utter falsehood.

On the other hand, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah had to grapple with the Kharijites and Mutazilites both of whom extend the scope of observance and practice to such an extent that they condemn defaulters with regard to practice as outside the pale of genuine faith and consider them eternally condemned to hell just like the heretics and hypocrites. The Imām considered all this rubbish and said that in reality actions were not a part of faith. He contended that action was not such an integral part of faith as held by them that its non-observance would liquidate faith and, in consequence thereof, the person would be condemned to hell. Hence every "Sunnite" group adopted a suitable interpretation to refute the arguments of each and every rival false group and tried its best to overwhelm them. Hence, divergence arose between interpretation and mode of expression. In fact, they agree in the adjudgement.

Progress and deterioration of Faith

Reference has often been made to the interpretation of the ancestors and indications of the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth* and the unanimity of Ashairites and the three Imāms that "الايمان يزيد وينقص" "The spirit of faith develops and deteriorates". That is faith has different characteristics; some are developed while others are defective. Reference has, likewise, been made to Imām Abū Ḥanifah and the Companions that "لا يزيد ولا ينقص" faith does not progress or deteriorate. Similarly, it is said that Imāmul Ḥaramain and Imām Rāzī and others are unanimous on this point.

Mawlana Sayyid Anwar Shah's viewpoint

Here the question arises as to whether the above dictum can be authentically attributed to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah or not. Mawlānā Anwar Shāh believed that the veracity of this statement is not proved from the earlier records. The succeeding writers have included it among their works. It occurs in the *Fiqh al-Akbar* but its attribution to the Imām is not established. Among the early writers Ḥāfiẓ ibn Taymiyyah has reproduced this statement from the Imām. But his temperament is so hot and aggressive that when he is bent upon contradicting any one he persists in it relentlessly. When a person of this nature reproduces a statement ascribed to an Imām of a different school of jurisprudence and that, too, when he is discussing controversial issues, one cannot be satisfied by his mere citation. And since we do not have its confirmation from any early writers, Mawlānā Anwar Shāh says he was about to deny the statement as coming from Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. But then he came across a reproduction of this statement in Ḥāfiẓ Abū 'Umar bin 'Abd al-Birr, who, though a Malikite, is very authentic and reliable. In the introduction to his book he has reproduced this statement from the Shaykh of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Shaykh Ḥammād. Mawlānā Anwar Shāh says that when he read that statement, which, though not attributed to the Imām, but since it appears to be the statement of his teacher, he thought the same could very probably have also been of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah.

My own opinion is that the lapse of time between Abū 'Umar 'Abd al-Birr and the Imām is quite a few centuries and further what he has reproduced he has not explicitly attributed to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah but to his Shaykh. There is, however, another reproduction which is more sound since its reporter belongs to a period which is closer in time to the period of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and because the statement is directly attributed to the Imām. Shaykh Abū al-Manṣūr al-Baghdādī in his *Kitāb al-Asma' wal Ṣifāt* has stated that Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī has reproduced the statement of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah as follows in his *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyah*:

Faith is not the genus of species. Neither does it progress nor deteriorate. Faiths of all men are equal.

اَلْإِيْمَانُ لَا يَتَبَعَّضُ وَلَا يَزِيْدُ وَلَا يَنْقُصُ
وَلَا يَتَفَاضَلُ النَّاسُ فِيْهِ

The reliability of Imām Abū al-Ḥasan Ash'arī as a narrator should be beyond all doubt and he is almost coeval of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, since he happens to be a contemporary of Imām Ṭaḥāwī and the latter is a pupil of Imām Muḥammad. This statement, therefore, makes us satisfied that the statement is of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah.

Another statement of Imam Abu Hanifah

Ghassān quotes another statement attributed to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah which has been accepted in books like the ***Sharḥi Iḥyā*** etc. This is as follows:

When faith increases, it does not decrease.

اَلْإِيْمَانُ يَزِيْدُ وَلَا يَنْقُصُ

Faith waxes; it wanes not

To establish the fact of rise in faith and to negate its fall, the Malikites have also quoted a similar statement from Imām Mālik “الا يمان يزيدو لاينقص” (Faith increases but does not decrease.) 'Abd Allāh bin Mubārak has been acknowledged as an undisputed scholar by the *Muḥaddithīn*, scholars, savants, the pious, devotees and so on and he was the pupil of Imām-i-A'ẓam. From him, also, a similar statement has come down. This statement is testified to, by the tenor of the Qur'ān, since we find the proof of the increase in faith, but not of decrease. The same is true of the *Ḥadīth*. Even a man, with as broad a vision as Ibn Taymīyyah had, acknowledges that, as in the Qur'ān, so in the *Ḥadīth* we find the word, *Ziyādat* (augmentation) and not *naqs* (diminution). The only exception is the *ḥadīth* in which the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has called women deficient in wisdom and religion but, here, the word used is *dīn* (religion), and not *īmān* which is under discussion.

Subject of discussion: Famous statement of Imams and Imam Abu Hanifah

We are, here, concerned with the famous statement of several 'Asharī scholars and the three Imāms that "الا يمان يزيدو ينقص" "faith increases and decrease", mentioned by Bukhārī herein, and with the famous dictum of scholastics and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah that "الا يمان لايزيدو لاينقص" "faith neither increases nor decrease". The arguments advanced by celebrated 'Asharī scholars and others are apparently based on Qur'ānic injunction and the Holy Prophet's traditions, wherein the word "زيادة" "increase" has been clearly mentioned. The word, *nuqṣan*, on the other hand, does not occur clearly. Nevertheless, we are in a position to formulate our own conjecture. Anything that can absorb an increase can also suffer diminution or loss. The expression (*lāyazīdo*) (neither increases) must have some meaning and purport, for a person of the status of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, who read the Qur'ān thirty or forty thousand times and who could finish the recitation within the span of a night, cannot be said to be ignorant of and oblivious to the *āyāt* in which this expression has occurred. Nor can it be said that he did not understand these *āyāt* or (God forbid!) he has acted against the spirit of the *āyāt* of the Qur'ān. We can, therefore, infer that the statement of the Imām and the scholastics must be having some meaning which is not contrary to the Qur'ān and may be reconciled to the *āyāt* of the Book of God, and that the proof adduced, in support of waxing, should not be amenable to its negation.

Imam Razi's Investigation

According to Imām Rāzī's viewpoint, this problem is derived from the first—that is to say in waxing and waning, conflicting components or absent components are subservient to conflict in observance. Thus, for those whose observance is a part of faith there would be waxing and waning of faith. Those who hold observance to be extraneous to faith and regard oral affirmation the essence of faith and believe it to be ancillary to it, would hold it to be impervious to growth and decrease. Thus, this conflict is subservient to the first and so would our judgement.

Imam Nawawi's view

Imām Nawawī has reproduced this statement and does not agree to its thesis, since, he believes, it is just possible that observance may not be an integral part of faith, and yet faith can wax and wane, since the essence of faith can give rise to several grades of faith. For instance, the faith of the Prophets and that of the common man by any sense cannot be of equivalent rank. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself says, "انا اعلمكم بالله" "I know more of God than any one of you". Even apart from this, attestation comprises three grades: (i) Belief arising from mere knowing; (ii) Belief arising from actual observation; and (iii) Absolute certainty. Take, for instance, the case of the heathens. Some of whom stick like limpets to their own faith and will not forsake it, at any cost, even if no efforts are spared to make them understand. This is called absolute certainty. Then there are those who are not stubborn and soon realise falsity of their religion. The same is the case with faith. Some have said that it has two grades: one is that which will relieve man from eternal fire and damnation and in accordance with "لولاه لامتنع" that is without this, entry into Heaven is religiously prohibited. It can never happen till eternity. For brevity sake, it is termed as the faith of the lowest grade, *Īmān-i-Munjī*.

The other grade is that which forthwith leads one to Paradise and higher ranks. And thus entry into Paradise depends upon it; that is, what was desired has been achieved. In other words, acquiring of the one leads to the acquiring of the other. In brief, this has been called the High Faith. On the other hand, *Īmān-i-Munjī* is the lowest faith exhausting the possibility of any lower stage and its further degradation means infidelity "وما ذابعد الحق الا الضلال" i.e. anything beyond faith is deviation from it. This class of faith "لايزيدو لاينقص" neither progresses nor deteriorates. And the exalted faith *Īmān-i-Mu'lī* "فهو يزيد وينقص" goes on increasing and decreasing.

The View of Ibn Hazm

Ibn Ḥazm Ẓāhirī who has written *Al-Milal wa al-Naḥl* in five volumes also holds that faith neither progresses or deteriorates. He has stated that attestation means such a staunch belief as does not admit of even the least doubt of contradiction and deterioration. This type of attestation is reliable in religious belief.

Suppose a person resolves firmly to believe in the unity of God and apostleship of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), there is a possibility of three issues—The first being, doubt and perplexity created in the heart, the second one is accusing faith of falsehood and the third one is an absolute belief admitting of no contrary. The first two are discarded being contrary to attestation involving combination of contraries. So the third one is sound involving no contrary because if it is defective, even in the least, it would admit of contrary. So the attestation in the sense of belief admitting of no contrary shall never exist, because it would be a question of doubt, confusion and perplexity upsetting faith. Consequently, faith in the sense of attestation, admitting of contraries, is absolutely wrong.

This might give rise to the doubt proved by observation that there is difference in the nature of belief. For instance, every one can understand the difference between the notional determination of Al-'ālam Ḥādith "the world is perishable" and the axiom of Alwāḥid Nisfulithnayn "One" is "half of two". So, how can it be correct to say that attestation does not admit of increase and decrease.

Ibn Ḥazm has refuted this that the approach of comprehension is misleading in such cases. It is not the verification of increase and decrease but according to their practical and theoretical nature, there is the difference of their being perceptible and imperceptible, and conveniently and inconveniently accessible to.

One is notional which takes time to establish its truth after great observation and thoughtful consideration and the other is self-evident requiring no observation and thought. As soon as it is heard, it is taken as a belief. Anyhow, whether by observation, or consideration, when it is established as a belief, such a belief is not affected in the least. Both beliefs are equal. But, we people take this type of perceptibility, convenience, imperceptibility and inconvenience for increase and decrease in belief. Ultimately, both the beliefs are equal. One is perceptible and convenient, the other is not so. It is not the case of increase and decrease.

Author's View—'Usmani's Viewpoint

We have, hitherto, discussed the views of others on the subject of increase and decrease in belief. We shall now present the view which we have already discussed also in the *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*. That is, the basis of faith lies in complete surrenders.

By this, what *sharī'ah* really means is the heart-felt submission and resignation as held by Ibn al-Hummām or according to Ibn Taymīyyah, it should be interpreted as essential faith or essential *sharī'ah* as held by Abū Ṭālib Makkī in the Quwwat al-Qulūb (The power of the hearts) Whatever interpretation we might adopt, the ultimate meaning would be:

Īmān based upon *sharī'ah* would be the adherence to the precepts and examples of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) and in believing the message he has brought.

إِنَّ الْإِيْمَانَ الشَّرْعِيَّ هُوَ الْتِزَامُ طَاعَةِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِيْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَّقَبُوْلُ كُلِّ مَا جَاءَ بِهٖ

This would amount to accepting and following heartily every thing brought by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Such submission is definitely indivisible and not subject to increase or decrease. Decrease in such faith would mean that a man would follow some of the edicts of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and not others; observe some parts of the *sharī'ah* and not others. Such a type of *īmān* is absolutely unacceptable and this state of affairs is the same, as narrated in the Qur'ān for censuring the People of the Book :—

Believe ye in part of the Scripture and disbelieve ye in part thereof? (Qur'ān, 2:85)

أَفَتُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِبَعْضِ الْكِتٰبِ وَتَكْفُرُوْنَ بِبَعْضٍ ۚ (البقرہ، آیت ٨٥)

And say : We believe in some and disbelieve in others. (Qur'ān, 4:150)

وَيَقُوْلُوْنَ نُؤْمِنُ بِبَعْضٍ وَّنَكْفُرُ بِبَعْضٍ (النساء، آیت ١٥٠)

So, such an amount of belief in the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or submission to the *sharī'ah* is necessary for all, without exception, be they prophets, testifiers, mystics and saints, or the ordinary Muslims, and believers in early Islam, or Islam after its completion. No *mu'min* can say that he would subscribe to such and such precept of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and not this and that one. Nor could any *mu'min*, during the earliest period of Islam, say that he believed in what had been revealed then, and not what was to follow later on.

In short, this much submission is essential and does not admit of increase or decrease. The total essence of faith subscribed to *mu'min* bihi (object of faith) is the same and all Muslims have professed faith in it. All have, therefore, the same essence of faith. The Qur'ān says :

The messenger believeth in that which hath been revealed unto him from his Lord and (so do) the believers. Each one believeth in Allāh and His Angels and His Scriptures and His messengers—We make no distinction between any of His messengers. (Qur'ān, 2:285)

اٰمَنَ الرَّسُوْلُ بِمَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْهِ مِنْ رَّبِّهٖ وَالْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ ۚ كُلٌّ اٰمَنَ بِاللّٰهِ وَمَلٰٓئِكَتِهٖ وَكُتُبِهٖ وَرُسُلِهٖ ۚ لَا نُفَرِّقُ بَيْنَ اَحَدٍ مِّنْ رُّسُلِهٖ (البقرہ آیت ٢٨٥)

The above *āyah* clearly sets forth that the faith professed by the prophets and *mu'mins* is the same. And therefore the faith of all is equal without any distinction.

Reasons for difference in the characteristics of faith

Of course, for other reasons, the difference in belief, faith may increase and decrease. For example, according to the firmness and weakness in belief, there can be the difference in the nature of attestation and essentials of submission. Some have stronger faith. There are still further grades. The faith of prophets, angels, and the Companions was stronger than a rock. Again, the *taṣdīq* of some is weaker. This has different types. In the statement attributed to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah reference has been made to this:

My faith is akin to the faith of Jibra'īl.

اِيْمَانِىْ كَاِيْمَانِ جِبْرَائِيْلَ

When asked how it was possible that we should possess *īmān* like the one possessed by an exalted angel like Gabriel and that we should be having attestation similar to his, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah replied:

I am not saying that my faith and that of Jibra'īl are equivalent, but that my faith is like his.

اَنَا لَآ اَقُوْلُ اِيْمَانِىْ مِثْلَ اِيْمَانِ جِبْرَائِيْلَ
وَلٰكِنْ اَقُوْلُ اِيْمَانِىْ كَاِيْمَانِ جِبْرَائِيْلَ

What Imām Abū Ḥanīfah meant was that he did not claim that his essence of faith, for apparent reasons, could be justified to be equal and similar to that of the Angel Jibra'īl "كايمان جبرائيل" which means that the essence of faith of Jibra'īl is the same as that of mine, though differing in *Taṣdīq*. The nature of the *Taṣdīq* of Jibra'īl is far stronger than that of mine. Consequently, setting aside these two interpretations, the third one has been adopted, which is clear in sense leaving no room for doubt:

But I say I have professed faith to what Jibra'īl professed.

وَلٰكِنْ اَقُوْلُ اٰمَنْتُ بِمَآ اٰمَنَ بِهٖ جِبْرَائِيْلُ

This would show that the subject-matter of the profession of both of us is the same.

The second reason of the difference in the nature of faith

The second reason for distinction could be due to the abbreviated and detailed nature of the essence of faith believed in. That is to say that the essential of submission to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or to the *sharī'ah* regarding faith is a question of synopsis of all commands having gradually descended during thirty years of the life of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). For instance, a man accepted Islam, at the very beginning when no other religious obligations exept prayers had been ordained. His acceptance of Islam *per se* implies that he would be accepting and following whatever other commands are brought forth, through the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). When *zakāt* became obligatory, it was by nature of a detail (as an individual obligation as well as part of the faith). Any one who has testified to the acceptance of the total *sharī'ah* would also obey these obligations as a part of the total *sharī'ah*. Then we have the obligation of *ṣawm* (fasting) followed by that of *Ḥajj*. In short, as the number of *āyahs* was on the increase, the details of the essence of the faith testified to, would also increase. Thus the essence of faith which existed before, that is essential of submission is still the same; only changes in the detail have occurred.

A question put to Imam Abu Hanifah regarding increase and decrease in faith

Shams al-Ayimmah Kurdī has reproduced in *Manāqib al-Īmām al-A'ẓam* (The Greatness of the Great Imām) the question which a person put to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah regarding increase and decrease in faith by presenting the following *āyah*:

As for those who believe, it hath increased them in faith. (Qur'ān, 9:124)

فَاَمَّا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا فَزَادَتْهُمْ اِيْمَانًا، (التوبہ آیت ۱۲۴)

This *āyah* clearly bespeaks increase in faith. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah said that was just right and said: "آمنوا بالجملة ثم بالتفصيل" That is, at first they believed in all the commandments concisely and then elaborately which was interpreted by increased faith. Even today, the difference between brevity and elaboration, according to knowledge, exists.

The third reason for the difference in the nature of faith

The texts of the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* clearly show that the belief in faith creates light and lusture on the face of a *mu'min*. As the visible lights vary like the light of the sun, the moon, the stars, lightning and even the flickering candle, the inward light of *mu'mins* acquired by belief in faith too varies according to 'Allāmah Kurdī. Some *mu'mins* have the privilege of great cheerfulness due to their belief in faith vastly developed. This, too, determines order of merit in respect of the prophets, the Companions, mystics, saints etc. Compared to the meritorial status of the foregoing, some have less privilege of light of faith as is the lot of the *mu'mins*, in general. The gist of the whole discourse is that the target of faith, for all, is one and the same. There are two things—one is an essential adherence to faith, the other is action. The increase and decrease in case of absolute faith are not even imagined. The difference between faith in *sharī'ah* and action, increase and decrease, strength and weakness in faith, brevity and detail has been elucidated by Imām Abū Ḥanīfah himself. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned eight factors which can cause increase and decrease in faith.

I now present before my readers a decisive aspect with regard to the two problems, that is, action being part of faith or not and whether faith increases or decreases.

Controversy due to faulty transcript

I had been since long after what has been said above and enquired into. Much stress has been laid on the positive aspect that according to the celebrated Hanafites creed action is not the part of faith and there is no increase in faith.

During the last few years, however, I have myself taken up another approach which, I believe, will be decisive to put an end to the whole controversy whatsoever between *salaf* and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. The problems bringing about this controversy are of two kinds. One is really controversial while the other is due to additions and alterations indiscriminately made on the basis of wrong transcripts causing distortion of facts and making the sense vague creating difference of opinion among the succeeding generations. If the correct transcripts of the contesting parties are put before vision, there can be no difference. Incorrect or faulty transcript is a thing that almost vitiates the meaning of the texts. Thus, in Dur al-Mukhtār (Gifts for the rulers) the problem of call to prayers has been given as follows :

It is desirable to stand up as soon as call to prayers is heard.

يَنْدُبُ الْقِيَامَ إِذَا سَمِعَ الْأَذَانَ

No one follows this. Nor is it appealing. What sense it makes that a person, whether he is reclining or sitting, should stand up immediately on hearing the call to prayer. Further, in Dur al-Mukhtār, reference has been made to the *Fatāwā Bazāzīyah*. 'Allāmah Shāmī says, in this connection that he searched for the reference in the *Fatāwā Bazāzīyah*, but he could not find it. It may be in some other manuscript of the book. Any way, this is not appealing. Shāmī has further stated that in *Nahr al-Fa'iq* (The Stream of the Paramount) the question of call to prayer has been mentioned differently: If a man is walking, he should pause till the call to prayer is over. This, in other words, is paying respect to *adhān*; it should not be heard unattentively. This seems to be appealing.

Now in the text, "يندب القيام اذا سمع الاذان" there are two things—the first one is that a sitting person should stand up which is not proper. The second is that a walking person should pause which is sensible. This is what actually the *Nahr al-Fā'iq* has detailed. But the author of *Dur al-Mukhtār* has been so succinct in his transcript that the real meaning has become vague creating ambiguity.

The controversy which we are discussing is also due to faulty transcript. It is therefore but essential that we should go through the actual transcript causing controversy. The text of *salaf*, I have copied in full, with reference to two reliable persons :

اَلْاِيْمَانُ مَعْرِفَةٌ ١ بِالْقَلْبِ وَاِقْرَارٌ ٢
بِاللِّسَانِ وَعَمَلٌ ٣ بِالْاَرْكَانِ يَزِيْدُ بِالطَّاعَةِ
وَيَنْقُصُ بِالْمَعْصِيَةِ ؞

Imān is the name of heart-felt submission, verbal affirmation and observance of doctorines of faith which improves by good deeds and lessens by the commitment of sins.

The nature of erroneous transcript

This is actually the transcript of the *salaf*. It has three abridgements. One is, that without mentioning all the three things, only "الايمان قول وعمل" "*Imān* is verbal affirmation and action" has been mentioned as Bukhārī has done although after interpretation the meaning is the same.

The second abridgement is that the words, "يزيد وينقص" "waxes and wanes" are used and the "بالطاعة" "submission" and "بالمعصية" "sin" are not used. As Bukhārī said: "يزيد وينقص". This abridgement interferes with the real purport and the real meaning of the sentence has been left concealed. What *salaf* meant could not be expressed without mentioning "بالطاعة" and "بالمعصية" without "submission" and "sin". Its omission has upset their purport. The third abridgement is in the continuity of the statement. For, from beginning to end, it was a full and intact statement which has been hived off to give rise to two problems. One was 'الايمان قول وعمل' that is, action is an integral part of faith. The second is "يزيد وينقص" that is, faith increases and decreases. Wherever, therefore, the statement, in belief of *al-salaf*, is transcribed, it is expressed as two problems, namely, 'action as a part of faith' and 'waxing and waning of faith'. Abridgement and excision have come to mask the original purport of the authors. This is what happens when a full passage comes to be hived off. For example, if "لا تقربوا الصلوة" "Do not go close to prayers" is separated from "وانتم سكارى" "if you are in a state of intoxication" the whole meaning would be reduced to absurdity. This backing of passages has been such as to keep us away from interpreting the purport of *al-salaf*.

The Statement of Imam Abu Hanifah as Reproduced by Tahawi

The most dependable reproduction of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's stand of belief, '*aqīdah*, is the one due to Ṭaḥāwī, as he was closer to the period of the Imām and was the pupil of Imām Muḥammad. In his book, '*Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwīyah*, he has expressly mentioned that he would reproduce the stand of belief, '*aqīdah*, of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and other Hanafite theologians. This shows how careful he has been. Imām Ṭaḥāwī thus reproduces in *'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* the stand of belief, *'aqīdah,* of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah as follows:[1]

> Faith is oral affirmation and attestation by the heart and (belief in) the commands of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*), which have been confirmed as being due to him, and which are subscribed to, through the following of the *sharī'ah* and exposition and (acknowledged as) true. And faith is unitary; and all those who believe are (in faith) equal. The distinction between the believers is in the degree of fear of God, righteousness, and in the attitude of denial of self-gratification and desire.

> اَلْاِیْمَانُ اِقْرَارٌ بِاللِّسَانِ وَتَصْدِیْقٌ بِالْجَنَانِ وَجَمِیْعُ مَا صَحَّ عَنْ رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّی اللّٰهُ عَلَیْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مِنَ الشَّرْعِ وَالْبَیَانِ کُلُّهٗ حَقٌّ وَ الْاِیْمَانُ وَاحِدٌ وَّاَهْلُهٗ فِیْ اَصْلِهٖ سَوَآءٌ وَّالتَّفَاضُلُ بَیْنَهُمْ بِالْخَشْیَةِ وَالتُّقٰی وَمُخَالَفَةِ الْهَوٰی وَمُلَازَمَةِ الْاَوْلٰی

This was the entire passage which the succeeding generations have mutilated and presented in the form of two separate problems. The first problem is as under:

> Faith is oral affirmation and attestation by the heart.

> اَلْاِیْمَانُ اِقْرَارٌ بِاللِّسَانِ وَتَصْدِیْقٌ بِالْجَنَانِ

This would show that observance is not a part of the faith, as observance has not been used as a conjunction to the observance of the essential fundamentals of faith; and this has been so abridged that "وجميع ما صح" "all that is correct" has been totally omitted and overlooked. The other problem is as follows:

> Faith neither increases nor decreases.

> اَلْاِیْمَانُ لَا یَزِیْدُ وَلَا یَنْقُصُ

This has been abstracted from, "واهله فى اصله سواء" "all the believers in faith are equal", which has been abridged in such a way that "والتفا ضل بينهم" "to distinguish believers in *Īmān*" has been omitted as if they have no concern with its interpretation.

The result of all this mutilation has been that the purport of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's statement has been blurred and not fully expounded. The statement of *salaf* (ancestors) and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah have been mutilated and two problems have been brought into existence. This has given rise to controversy. We have nevertheless, reproduced both the statements in their original form from which is evident that the statement by Imām Abū Ḥanīfah is not opposed in any way to that of *salaf* (the ancestors); it is, on the contrary, an elaboration thereof.

The Truthful and the false people

We have already said that the real conflict of the Hanafites was with the Mutazilites, Kharijites, and the Murjites, and the *salaf* (the ancestors) had to refute the Murjites, on the one hand, and the Mutazilites and Kharijites on the other. The Murjites were answered by the rejoinder. "الايمان معرفة بالقلب واقرار باللسان وعمل بالاركان", that is, "you hold faith to be free of observance, and say that the thousands of deleterious acts do not in the least mar the faith." This is patently erroneous. This is wrong, for acts are part of the faith and should be taken cognizance of. Thus the Murjites are fully rebutted.

---

[1] This portion is on the page 277 of *Sharḥ al-Tahāwīyyā fī al-'Aqīdata al-salfiyyah,* published by *Maktabat al-Riyāḍ al-Ḥadīthah*. This compilation is of 'Allāmah Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī bin 'Alī bin Muḥammad bin Abī al-'Izz al-Ḥanafī—(731-792). It is regretted that I could not reproduce it in the footnote of *Faḍl al-Bārī* in Urdu edition because at that time this book was not in our library for reference.

At the other end, the Mutazilites and the Kharijites were on the lookout to pounce from a position of vantage. For them it was a point consolidating their position to assert that action is part of the *īmān*. It was in order to refute their statement that it was said: 'يزيد بالطاعة وينقص بالمعصية' "That is to say, action is not such an essential part of faith that non-observance of which would render the defaulter devoid of faith such as attestation is." On the other hand, actions are such part of *īmān* that the dificiency in their observance causes increase and decrease in the grades of faith, although, essence of faith is still intact. This has contradicted Mutazailites and Kharijites. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah also holds the same view. Of course, this is true that he has elaborated the views of *salaf* (ancestors) for the reason that he meant to justify the views of the *salaf* on "يزيد بالطاعة وينقص بالمعصية" by declaring that *īmān* is composed of three components. But not all the components are equal. In fact, the first two—that is, attestation and oral affirmation are the roots, whereas action is a variable component causing proportionate decrease and increase in faith. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, analyzing the statement of *salaf*, showed that, although Faith (*īmān*) consists of three component parts—attestation, affirmation and action—yet these are based upon some doctrines of religion as well as derivatives. Real faith which is the pivot of redemption consists in attestation by the heart and oral affirmation. This means the believer should submit to the commands and edicts of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) as stand proven to have emanated from him. As far as faith and this submission are concerned, all are equal. Nevertheless, distinction in the status and higher and lower class of the believer, the superiority of the acts of one over the other stands established with respect to the derivative nature of faith. This point has been highlighted (in Ṭaḥāwī's reproduction) by a reference to "والتفاضل" *wa al-tafāḍulo*. Thus the Imām's passage is an exposition of the statement of *salaf* (the ancestors). The theologians analyse and comment on the *Ḥadīth* "صفة الصلوٰة" "characteristics of prayer" in respect of its some portion being binding and some being desireable, (*mustaḥab*) etc. This is not to differ from the context of the *ḥadīth* in question but to unfold and expound its purport and meaning. The three things—attestation, oral affirmation, and observance—had not been clarified properly by the Sunnite doctors. What should have been done was to have shown which part was fundamental and which was derivative. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah in his analysis has highlighted this distinction by segregating "اقرار باللسان وتصديق بالجنان" "oral affirmation and attestation by the heart." He has thus established these twin characteristics as the essential of faith.

He has not even left action. He has clearly stated that all the edicts of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) as traceable to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) beyond show of doubt are to be subscribed to. He has made the point clear by calling faith "unitary". A tree is not to be identified through its root alone; its floral, flowering, and truck characteristics have to be taken into account in order to form a correct concept of tree. But the tree is not a simple thing, it is complex. There are some components the absence of which will no doubt, vitiate its existence; but it will, all the same, be the tree. Such parts are the leaves and the boughs. There are, however, a certain component without which the existence of the tree will be obliviated e.g., the root. Despite the presence of the leaves and the boughs, the excision of the root will spell the destruction of the tree itself.

A Detailed Exposition of the Stand of Imam Abu Hanifah

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, in the same way, says *īman* is the sum total and complex of the three characteristics or components that have been described above. Thus, the tree from the head to the foot is composed of the different characteristics that make it what it is, although its parts in nature and hierarchic characteristics, are different from each other. The sum total, therefore, of all is *īmān*. As long as *īmān* is in the heart, it is attestation and belief but when it comes to the tongue (and is expressed in words), it is called *iqrār* (oral affirmation). When from the tongue it moves to the other members of the body and is expressed in the form of acts, it is known as observance or practice, (*'amal*). Thus, from the beginning to the end, it is one and the same thing whose means have undergone variations because of the different ways of its expression.

This point has been emphasized by Imām Abū Ḥanīfah to vindicate the unitary nature of faith. "الايمان واحد" This is the exposition of the statement of *salaf* (the ancestors) that *īmān* increases with subservience. The point to note is that the nature of all the ingredients is not identical. It is also evident from statement of *salaf* (the ancestors), there is a variation in the grades of faith; some are higher, whereas the others are lower.

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah now explains that in the different grades there will be one beyond which there is no other grade to be looked into. If we go still lower down, then what we shall get shall be its opposite. For example, vision is a unitary characteristic, but there are, people who have been endowed with the sharper or poorer kind of vision. There are persons who, in the afternoon can see the stars, while there are others who can with difficultly view them at night. We shall then finally come to a stage of vision lower than that would be no vision. This would be the stage when the person would be called blind. The analogy likewise applies to wisdom. There is a stage beyond which wisdom disappears and we have the stage of madness.

We have thus the base of wisdom and vision and this is a point beyond which neither wisdom nor vision would exist. These are the very roots of wisdom and vision. As long as the characteristics of wisdom and vision or sight are perceptible, their possessor would be known as one who perceives and has a modicum of wisdom. Such a degree of incumbency is obligatory for the characteristics associated with wisdom and vision to assert themselves, since there is no possibility of further vitiation.

It is probably for this reason that the statements to the effect that *īmān* records an increase, and does not decrease have been ascribed to Imām Ḥanīfah, Imām Mālik, and Imām Ibn al-Mubārak. The order above and low would be in surplus and deficit, and, from this viewpoint, it might also be permissible to assert that *īmān* increases and decreases ("يزيدو ينقص".)

It should consequently be understood that *salaf* (the ancestors) have called *īmān* differentiated, surplus, and deficit. We shall, on analysis, arrive at an ultimate point which is the last stage in reduction of *īmān*. Any descending beyond this point would obliterate *īmān*, and *kufr*, its opposite, would be established. It is probably this minimum point of faith which has been alluded to, in the *Ḥadīth* on Intercession (*Ḥadīth al-shafā'at*). Some people will remain with the degrees of faith so low that they will even escape the notice of the Prophets. God Himself shall remove these persons (from perdition) and it is possibly this grade of faith which has been called by Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn ibn al-'Arabī (Shaykh Akbar) as the *īmān al-Fiṭrah* (natural faith) with which a child is born and is like unto rubies (*kamā fī al yawāqīt*) from *al-yawāqito waljawāhir*, the book of 'Allāmah 'Abdul Wahhāb Sha'rānī.

Be that as it may, this is the real root of *īmān*, and as long as a person possesses that he is entitled to be called a *mu'min*. This characteristic is common to all the believers and does not admit of excess further of deficit therein. Beyond the minimum point, however, the question of surplus and deficit does come into play and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah says in this context "واهله فى اصله سوآء" *wa ahluhū fī aṣlihī sawaun* (vide supra). Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, it should be noted, has said "واهله فى اصله سواء" "and all those who believe are (in faith) equal". He has not said "اهله فيه سوآء" "between them there is equality, but "واهله فى اصله سواء" those who subscribe to the faith are equal." This should be self-evident from what has gone before. This point has been alluded to, in the statements of *salaf* (the ancestors) also, as they have not referred to mere "يزيدو ينقص" increasing and decreasing as is frequently ascribed to them but have said that *īmān* increases from submission and decreases from the commitment of sins. "يزيد بالطاعة وينقص بالمعصية" Allusion here is to the acts which are in addition to the above minimum faith and it is because of this that the possibility of increase or decrease exists. It is not the root which is being held amenable to increase or decrease. The two basic points that emerge from the statement of *salaf* (the ancestors) are that (a) all the parts do not bear equality: and (b) that the basis of differentiating their grades is the same according to which all are equal, and as long as they possess it they will be *mu'mins*. These two problems now stand explained and the Mutazilites and the Kharijites also stand refuted. The Murjites could however allude to "فى اصله سوآء" and claim that action according to it is totally useless. This objection has been counteracted by saying "والتفاضل بينهم الخ" which implies that deeds are not at all useless (in context with faith): they determine whether the grade of faith is higher or lower, and God also has said:

Lo! the noblest of you, in the sight
of Allāh, is the best in conduct.
(Qur'ān, (49:13)

اِنَّ اَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ اَتْقٰكُمْ (الحجرات، آيت ۱۳)

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's statement "يزيد بالطاعة وينقص بالمعصية" therefore is in conformity with that of *salaf* (the ancestors) to the effect that *īmān* thrives on submission and suffers from sins. In fact, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah subscribes to "ملازمة الاولى" (that is, submission to what is the best alternative), and the Imām thus exceeds the stand adopted by the others. This pasage thus refutes the Murjite contention thoroughly.

Thus the statements of the Imām are in conformity with those of *salaf* (the ancestors) and they are likewise adduced to refute the arguments of the same sects. The only difference is that *salaf* (the ancestors) concentrated on the rebuttal of the Murjites in the first part of the statement and on that of the Kharijites and the Mutazilites in the later part. The Imām adopted exactly the opposite stance. He refuted first those with whom he experienced the greatest amount of opposition. Real meaning and purpose have not changed.

We agree that in the view of the Imām, acts constitute a part of faith. There is no reason to deny this as should be evident from the

Imām's statement: "الايمان واحد" faith is unitary. Only the derivative parts differentiate themselves. All believe—and we agree—that for the Imām there is a point of faith in which there is superiority in grade as should be evident from "والتفاضل بينهم الخ" (vide supra). The Imām has thus derived two grades; one is that which admits of no differentiation and in which all are equal. This is the root. The second is that which is susceptible to differentiation. The Qur'ān has:

> Of those messengers, some of whom We have caused to excel others. (Qur'ān, 2:253)
>
> تِلْكَ الرُّسُلُ فَضَّلْنَا بَعْضَهُمْ عَلٰى بَعْضٍ (بقره، آيت ۲۵۳)

The *Ḥadīth* has:

> Do not try to attach preference to one Prophet over the other.
>
> لَا تُفَضِّلُوا بَيْنَ الْاَنْبِيَاءِ

On another occasion the Qur'ān says:

> We make no distinction between any of His messengers. (Qur'ān, 2:285)
>
> لَا نُفَرِّقُ بَيْنَ اَحَدٍ مِّنْ رُّسُلِهٖ (بقره، آيت ۲۸۵)

So far as the characteristic of Prophethood is concerned, all the Prophets are equal and, accordingly, there is no distinction between any of them. But each one of them has his own distinct characteristics, just as the ministers of a king have different portfolios–Defence Minister, Finance Minister, Education Minister and Prime Minister with different assignments. Similarly, there is distinction between the Prophets. The statement of *salaf* (the ancestors) also substantiates it, as they have not at all, said, "يزيدو ينقص" "faith increases and decreases" but have laid down the condition of "بالطاعة و بالمعصية" "it improves by submission and decreases by sins", making no difference between the passage of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and the passage of *salaf* (the ancestors). So some of the commentators who have seen Ṭaḥawī's reproduction of the statement, have clearly said that they have no reason to find out disagreement between *salaf* (the ancestors) and the Imām. After that, when the people created interceptions in their statements the real theme and the purpose, left concealed, became the cause of difference between Abū Ḥanīfah and the *sclaf* because, when the statement of *salaf* "الايمان تصديق بالجنان واقرار باللسان وعمل بالاركان" has been separated from "يزيد بالطاعة الخ" and made a permanent issue, the real characteristics of action, according to the *salaf*, have been veiled up because the importance of the observance of the basic principles of faith was made out by the very sentence. "يزيد بالطاعة" Similarly, when "يزيد بالطاعة وينقص بالمعصية" was taken away from the preceding context and made an independent issue, omitting, "بالطاعة و بالمصيعة" the whole purport of the sentence became vague as this clause was related to subservience to the doctorines of faith and which was actually complementary to the preceding context which has assumed the problem of increasing and decreasing of the faith. How? It is not known.

By the same token, the Imām's statement "اقرار باللسان وتصديق بالجنان" was mutilated and made an independent problem. The qualifying words, "وجميع ماصح الخ" and "الايمان واحد" were also omitted. This has created an issue that observance of the doctorines of faith is indivisible, again creating a problem that action is an integral part of faith. Similarly "اهله فی اصله سوآء" was taken away and "والتفاضل بينهم الخ" also was omitted which was made to understand that *īmān* never decreases or increases. The word, "سوآء" "equal", was made into the statement, "الايمان لايزيد ولاينقص" "that is, *īmān*, neither increases nor decreases".

Varieties of *Kufr* (Infidelity)

Īmān is the name of submission and affirmation and its antonym is *kufr* (infidelity). The denial of affirmation has varied aspects giving rise to four kinds of *kufr*. Absence of affirmation causes *kufr* thus: If it is by heart and tongue both, it is *kufr-e-inkār*; if it is only by tongue, it is of two kinds—after *ma'rifat* and attestation by heart, it is *kufr-e-juḥūd*; after attestation by heart and oral affirmation, by way of enmity, blind faith in the ancestors, craving for territory and wealth and any other consideration of the like, it is *kufr-e-'inād*. After affirmation and attestation by tongue, if there is the absence of attestation by heart, it is *kufr-e-Nifāq*.

Iman (faith) and the Successive Traditions

Īmān from the point of view of the *sharī'ah* has been defined as something that has been established to emanate from faith as a matter of necessity. By necessity we imply that it should be derived from faith as established by the successive traditions, whether intuitional or conceptual.

An aspect established by the successive *Aḥādīth* (*tawātur*) is that which has gained so much in fame and currency that a sizeable population of the common and the elite, having love for the religion, should have accepted it and put their trust in it. Examples of these beliefs are monotheism (*tawḥīd*). Prophethood (*nubūwah*), the termination of the Prophethood (*Khatm-e-risālat*) and Resurrection, ordeal of the grave, etc., all these aspects are conceptual (beliefs), but the Traditions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) have furnished necessary proof in their favour. The word (necessity) in Islam means that its being a part of the faith should stand proven by means of successive *Aḥādīth*, even though the commandment may be of a purely conceptual nature. And the word, necessity, does not mean in this context that conformity to it would be necessary. There are certain aspects of the religion that demand acceptance, however far removed they might be from actual experience. A corpus of knowledge can thus be gained from the successive *Aḥādīth* which are divided into four kinds and are discussed below.

Succession or Continuation of Authorities.

This is the kind of succession known to the *Muḥaddithīn* as *tawātur*. It has been defined as:

Any *ḥadīth* that has been narrated by so many authorities that it would be impossible to imagine that such a large number of people should have unanimity to term it a lie.

أَنْ يَّرْوِيَ الْحَدِيْثَ مِنْ أَوَّلِ الْإِسْنَادِ إِلَى
آخِرِهٖ جَمَاعَةٌ يَسْتَحِيْلُ اجْتِمَاعُهُمْ عَلَى الْكَذِبِ ؞

The following *ḥadīth* thus is a *mutawātir ḥadīth*:

Anyone who tells a lie on my behalf shall carve out a place for himself in Hell.

مَنْ كَذَبَ عَلَيَّ مُتَعَمِّدًا فَلْيَتَبَوَّأْ مَقْعَدَهٗ مِنَ النَّارِ .

Hierarchical Succession

A hierarchical succession or continuation is one for which, from the standpoint of the *Muḥaddithīn* it is not only virtually impossible to quote several authorities but even to produce one. But from the beginning to the end, such narrations have been universally accepted from one order to the other, and are not based upon the narrations of such and such authority. Such is the *tawātur* of the Qur'ān. It is the same Qur'ān that was sent to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) by means of *waḥī*, and not one word has been added to or subtracted from it. Although there is no *sanad* for the Qur'ānic *āyahs* upto the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), yet its *tawātur* is self-evident from the east to the west, through education, recitation, memorization, and chanting. And thus "تلقى الكافة عن الكافة واخذ الطبقة عن الطبقة" congregation of a large number of people from a large number of persons derived from one order that followed another, has been in currency from the time of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). This hierarchical succession has been in existence from the time of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and neither a *mu'min* nor a *kāfir*, an opponent or a proponent, friend or foe, can deny the validity of this hierarchical succession. Only he who is prompted by personal animosity or love for sarcasm and haughtily denies the validity of what has been proved by observation, would deny it, and, since such a person acts contrary to what is indicated by perception, it is useless to argue with him.

It is difficult to produce a sufficient number of precedents on the observance of traditions similar to those established by the observance of *muḥaddithīn* :

The traditional observance is that to which so many people have been adhering since the time of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallalāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) whose such adherence to any false and wrong practice might have been impossible.

إِنَّهٗ يُعْمَلُ بِهٖ فِيْ كُلِّ قَرْنٍ مِّنْ عَهْدِ صَاحِبِ
الشَّرِيْعَةِ إِلٰى يَوْمِنَا هٰذَا جَمٌّ غَفِيْرٌ مِّنَ الْعَامِلِيْنَ
بِحَيْثُ يَسْتَحِيْلُ عَادَةً تَوَاطُئُهُمْ عَلٰى كَذِبٍ أَوْ غَلَطٍ

Among such practices, are brushing of the teeth during ablution, the earlier and later congregations on the occasion of *Ḥajj* (*jam'itaqdīm* and *jam'itākhīr*), similarly prayers and fasting, etc.

Constancy of a Common Factor

Constancy of a common factor is the determination of a common factor in tradition despite differences or variations in the narrations.

(The succession of a common factor) derives from different versions such that one party of the narrators describes one and the other, another incident, and so on. But all these incidents should harbour a common factor all the time. This common factor is called throughout, consistent in sense.

وَهُوَ مَا تَخْتَلِفُ فِيْهِ أَلْفَاظُ الرُّوَاةِ بِأَنْ
يَّرْوِيَ قِسْمٌ مِّنْهُمْ وَاقِعَةً وَّغَيْرُهٗ وَاقِعَةً أُخْرٰى
وَهَلُمَّ جَرًّا غَيْرَ أَنَّ هٰذِهِ الْوَقَائِعَ تَكُوْنُ مُشْتَمِلَةً
عَلٰى قَدْرٍ مُّشْتَرَكٍ فَهٰذَا الْقَدْرُ الْمُشْتَرَكُ
بِالْمُتَوَاتِرِ الْمَعْنَوِيِّ وَالْمُتَوَاتِرُ مِنْ جِهَةِ الْمَعْنٰى

For example, if we say that Ḥātim Ṭā'ī gave ten rupees to A, rupees twenty to B, and rupees one hundred to C, clothes to D, horse to E, etc,. such incidents have been quoted in large numbers. Individually, no single incident may be successive but, when all the narrations are collectively considered, we do get a common denominator to the effect that Ḥātim was excessively generous and compassionate. The same thing goes for the miracles of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). So far as *tawātur* is concerned, probably no miracle is proved to have come in succession, but, when all the narrations are collated and examined, we find that supernatural practices can definitely be attributed to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The same goes for *karāmāt* of the saints. We have discussed this point in detail in the preface of *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*.

In my opinion, the four kinds of successions in traditions are irrefutable and any one who denies them would be a *kāfir*. I have not seen a statement against this fact. The third kind only has been discussed in ***Bidāyatul Mujtahid*** by Ibn Rushd Mālikī who has said that any one who does not accept this succession and is called *kāfir* is not irrefutable and so it is a disputed point.[1]

Īmān a light and its Grades are determined by Acts

Īmān is light as stated in the Qur'ān. Luminance and light are not equivalent in nature.

Is he whose bosom Allāh hath expanded for the Surrender (unto Him), so that, he followeth a light from His Lord. (Qur'ān, 39:22)

أَفَمَنْ شَرَحَ اللّٰهُ صَدْرَهٗ لِلْإِسْلَامِ فَهُوَ
عَلٰى نُوْرٍ مِّنْ رَّبِّهٖ ؕ (زمر، آیت ۲۲)

Similarly, on another occasion, God says:

Is he who was dead and We have raised him unto life, and set for him a light wherein he walketh among men...? (Qur'ān, 6:122)

أَوَمَنْ كَانَ مَيْتًا فَأَحْيَيْنٰهُ وَجَعَلْنَا لَهٗ
نُوْرًا يَّمْشِيْ بِهٖ فِي النَّاسِ (الانعام، آیت ۱۲۳)

So a person who suffered spiritual death so to say in disgrace and ignorance throughout his life but whom God brought to spiritual life again, blessed him with soul of *Īmān* and *ma'rifat* and bestowed upon him the insight in faith, now walks with the people freely on the right path. Again, on another occasion He said:

He bringeth them out of darkness into light. (Qur'ān, 2:257)

يُخْرِجُهُمْ مِّنَ الظُّلُمٰتِ إِلَى النُّوْرِ ۟ (البقرہ، آیت ۲۵۶)

This light would itself be manifested on Pulṣirāṭ on the Day of Judgment. And the Qur'ān therefore has :

On the day when Allāh will not abase the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) and those who believe with him. Their light will run before them and on their right hands. (Qur'ān, 66:8)

يَوْمَ لَا يُخْزِي اللّٰهُ النَّبِيَّ وَالَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعَهٗ
نُوْرُهُمْ يَسْعٰى بَيْنَ أَيْدِيْهِمْ وَبِأَيْمَانِهِمْ (التحریم آیت ۸)

Further, God has said :

On the day when thou (Muḥammad *ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) wilt see the believers, men and women, their light shining forth before them and on their right hands. (Qur'ān, 57:12)

يَوْمَ تَرَى الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ وَالْمُؤْمِنٰتِ يَسْعٰى
نُوْرُهُمْ بَيْنَ أَيْدِيْهِمْ وَبِأَيْمَانِهِمْ (الحدید آیت ۱۲)

Immediately afterwards He said :

On the day when the hypocritical men and the hypocritical women will say unto those who believe: Look on us that we may borrow from your light. (Qur'ān, 57:13)

يَوْمَ يَقُوْلُ الْمُنٰفِقُوْنَ وَالْمُنٰفِقٰتُ لِلَّذِيْنَ
اٰمَنُوا انْظُرُوْنَا نَقْتَبِسْ مِنْ نُّوْرِكُمْ ۚ (الحدید آیت ۱۳)

Ḥanafites hold that observance in faith creates expansion and cheerfulness in the light derived from faith, bringing about so many classifications and categories in the believers. 'Allāmah Kurdī, a great Ḥanafite theologian, interprets the development of faith, occurring in any of the Qur'ānic texts, by the sense of the development of light derived from faith; the real purport is the development of light rather than the development of the existence of faith. In sum, even though they hold that action is not an integral part of faith, the Ḥanafite doctors do not deny that action constitutes the auxiliaries and ancillaries to faith.

---

[1] Note: Regarding exhaustive explanation of *Imān* with unrebutted arguments by Imām Abū Ḥanifah, see page 271, *Faḍl al-Bārī* under heading Caution.

Consequently, all the arguments that Imām Bukhārī would muster in support of observance being a part of faith (such as the statements of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) about the basis of Islam laid upon five doctorines and on feeding on the victuals of *īmān*), the answer would, in all such cases, be that what is meant is the auxiliary of faith, not faith itself. If this were otherwise, dissociation between faith and observance would have led to the loss of the reality of faith as well.

All of Imām Bukhārī's arguments and Qur'ānic text, therefore, in favour of increasing and decreasing of faith, would be the development of *īmān* rather than increase in faith. This point must be kept in mind as we would be discussing this, off and on.

We have already discussed the relationship between *īmān* and observance in relation to the beliefs and views of the different sects. We now propose to discuss Imām Bukhārī's arguments and allusions.

بَابُ قَوْلِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بُنِيَ الْإِسْلَامُ عَلَى خَمْسٍ

The Holy Prophet's statement is that the basis of Islam is on five doctorines. This proves that Islam is a complex of which the acts are parts. We have already said that for Bukhārī *īmān* and Islam are identical. Here therefore Bukhārī has made Islam synonymous with *īmān*. We thus have the composition of faith and the entry of acts thereinto. A thing that is compounded, accepts increase or decrease from the different ingredients which would lead us again to the increasing and decreasing of faith. There are, thus, as we know, two problems before us: the problem of the composition of faith and its scope and its susceptibility to increase or decrease.

The object of "هو" (and it) would be Islam also, since, وهو for Bukhārī *īmān* and Islam are one. But, since in the view of *salaf* (the ancestors) *īmān* is composed of oral affirmation and observance, and the word actually used is *īmān* and not Islam and Bukhārī follows *salaf* (the ancestors), it is more reasonable to assume that the word *īmān* would be the object of "وهو".

وَهُوَ قَوْلٌ وَّفِعْلٌ

Īmān is compounded of verbal affirmation and observance. *Salaf* (the ancestors) had used the word "قول و عمل" "statement and observance thereof". Bukhārī, instead of observance "عمل" has used the word, "فعل". There is some distinction between the two as has been emphasized in lexicons like the *Taj al-'Urūs*, etc. But one can be easily applicable to the other. Bukhārī has not, however, mentioned testimony—the real part and object of faith—here he has contented himself with the mention of verbal affirmation. Therefore, either the statement should be stretched further to embrace both statement of the heart and verbal affirmation or the act should be understood to denote something general, that is, the act of the heart or testimony and physical action or observance. The most reasonable reply that one can give is that, on the question of testimony being the essence of faith, there are no two opinions in the different religions. This point needs no more elucidation and the two parts on which there existed some difference have been discussed.

لِيَزْدَادُوْا اِيْمَانًا مَّعَ اِيْمَانِهِمْ

So that there may be an increase in their initial faith. In *āyah* 4 of *Al-Fatḥ* it is firstly, the increase of faith that has been mentioned. In the second place the words, "ايماناً مع ايمانهم"

carry a sense of association. That is to say, there was one grade of *īmān* earlier to which has been added its higher grade, thereby proving that an increase of faith has come into being. But I shall first take up the meaning of the *āyah* (verse) so that we might later arrive at a decision.

The Meaning of 'ليزدادوا ايمانا مع ايمانهم' 'That they may add faith to their faith'

Let us begin our discussion with an example. It is not an easy task to undertake to lay down one's life if one is asked to do so. Those who fight are confronted with an extremely exacting task of giving or taking life. Only they who have dedicated themselves to the commands of their Lord would be in a position to do so. The same thing holds good if brave soldiers are commanded to lay down their arms and to surrender to the enemy, agreeing unconditionally. This act of abject surrender and derogation can only be performed if the soldiers are tacitly and unhesitatingly devoted to their liege and lord. The second order is even more difficult to obey than the first and only those who are unswerving in their loyalty will follow it. For those whose subservience is moderate or only superficial would falter and disobey. Thus, if a strong and vigorous person is ordered to fight he will not find it difficult since this is in keeping with his nature and inclination, but, if in the case of his preparedness, he is ordered to surrender before the enemy, he would naturally be greatly pained by such a command, since this is contrary to his very nature.

The Oath of Ridwan

Now that we have explained this point, we can proceed further. On the occasion of the truce of *Ḥudaybiyah* a rumour spread that Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān, the emissary of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), sent to Makkah, had either been slain or imprisoned. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) thereupon, prepared for *jihād* and took an oath from fourteen, fifteen or sixteen hundred Companions present there. All those present swore that they would voluntarily die for the cause, and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) accepted oath from each of them. Some were so overcome by zeal that they took the oath (bay'ah) twice and even thrice, as was the case with Ḥaḍrat Salmah bin al-Akwa'. It is this oath (bay'at) which is known as "بيعت رضوان". What was the attraction that led the Companions to the display of such a high and exalted degree of self-sacrifice? It was obviously the vital force of pure reliance on faith and tacit submission to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) which made all of them bid welcome to death without the exercise of any external pressure or force. None of the Companions displayed the slightest hesitation. All, without exception, responded to the call. None vacillated as the Israelites did whom Saul led,[1] or the flock of Prophet Moses, (عليه السلام) as has been narrated in detail in the Qur'ān.

The Companions, already oppressed and harassed, were ablaze with zeal; they were keen that the issue should be settled once for all by the sword. They were not lacking even in strength and courage. History itself is a witness to the fact that before such a valorous and fearless soldiery comprising of the Companions the Quraysh and their allies paled into insignificance.

When, however, Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān returned from Makkah, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), considering the situation and the consequences that would emanate from the alternatives of war and peace, agreed to renew the truce.

---

[1] Of. Chronicles, 10.

The infidels of Makkah had laid down such conditions that were, apparently, derogatory to the Muslims and almost meant a total surrender by the latter. The conditions of the truce indeed completely went in favour of the Qurayshite infidels. The Companions and Ḥaḍrat 'Umar especially, felt greatly depressed by these stipulations and the dialogue between the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and Ḥaḍrat 'Umar about the circumambulation of Ka'bah and argument with the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) about the terms of peace has been described in detail in the *Aḥādīth* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). But the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) provided solace to the Companions by saying الله ورسوله اعلم (God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) know (best). The document of the truce was at last ready and the Companions, one and all, followed the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to the word. The *Ḥadīth* has it that the Companions showed such remarkable haste in undressing the *Iḥrām* and shaving the head (*ḥalaq*) that there was a possibility that their heads might be cut off in case of any delay caused in compliance. It is nothing short of wonder that the Companions, possessing such an amazing degree of puissance, should have laid down their weapons of war before the enemy and acceded to conditions which were apparently abject and degrading. But, all the same, they did not swerve from the command of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and did not show the obstinacy to the obstinate infidels. It was the power of faith and their tacit obedience to the orders of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) which enabled them to acquit themselves with dignity in such a trying situation. The Companions, notwithstanding the fact that to do such a thing was diametrically opposed to the demands of their nature and inclinations, bowed down in subservience to the command of their Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). We thus have the reflection of faith in two colours (forms). At first, taking oath for *jihād*, showed that they were ever ready to lay down their lives in the path of faith. The second colour (form) was evident from their willing consent to the renewal of the truce of *Ḥudaybiyah*, when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) graced the demands of the infidels with acceptance. It should be obvious that, when this colour (form) appeared after the first, the degree of the faith of the Companions recorded an increase. Their progress in the elevation of inner faith and belief also registered further increase and progress. This was a favour bestowed on them by God, and the Qur'ān says :

He it is Who sent down peace of reassurance into the hearts of the believers that they might add faith unto their faith.
(Qur'ān, 48:4)

هُوَ الَّذِيْٓ اَنْزَلَ السَّكِيْنَةَ فِيْ قُلُوْبِ
الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ لِيَزْدَادُوْٓا اِيْمَانًا مَّعَ اِيْمَانِهِمْ ط
(الفتح، آیت ٤)

The first kind of tranquillity—*sakīnah al-awwal*—imparted (to the Companions) unswerving readiness to fight, whereas the second inculcated unconditional stoppage of warfare. Both are in accordance with the commands and acquiescence of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and for this reason both are to be categorised as subservience. Obedience to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) increases the light of faith. We might call it the progress of faith, as is the view of Bukhārī or increase in the degree of faith because of the enhanced practice of an act. The latter is not denied by the Ḥanafites. Here the progress is not in the essence of faith but in status and grade which are among the auxiliaries. The *āyah* thus explained should clarify, all the more, the Ḥanafite stand.

Imam Abu Hanifah and 'Allamah Zamakhshri

There is another implication which is resolved by the foregoing discussion. 'Allāmah Zamakhshrī, despite his having been a Mutazilite, is an acknowledged authority in 'Arabic. He borrows Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's statement, "امنوا بالجملة ثم بالتفصيل" because Zamakhshrī preferred the Ḥanafite point of view in matters of auxiliary details. He has taken and reproduced this statement in order to offer a rejoinder from the Ḥanafite side, and included it in his Tafsīr al-Kashshāf under the head of the *āyah* under discussion. But this statement of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah is applicable only where the descent of a new *sūrah* or command is alluded to, and which would result in increment in the faith of *mu'min*. And the Qur'ān therefore says:

> And whenever a *sūrah* is revealed, there are some of them who say: Which one of you hath thus increased in faith? As for those who believe, it hath increased them in faith and they rejoice (therefor).
> (Qur'ān, 9:124)

وَإِذَا مَا أُنْزِلَتْ سُوْرَةٌ فَمِنْهُمْ مَّنْ يَّقُوْلُ
أَيُّكُمْ زَادَتْهُ هٰذِهٖ إِيْمَانًا ج فَأَمَّا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا
فَزَادَتْهُمْ إِيْمَانًا وَّهُمْ يَسْتَبْشِرُوْنَ (التوبہ آیت ۱۲۴)

In instances such as the above it is possible for the Imām's statement to be applicable, since an *āyah* which brings new commands would enlarge the source of the essence of faith and therefore an increase in faith. In other words, the statement, "امنوا بالجملة ثم بالتفصيل" would be applicable. Apparently, therefore Zamakhshrī's reproduction of this statement seems to be out of the context and inappropriate but, considering the above point, it might be held that Imām's statement is relevant. The Companions—first and foremost—believed in submission to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (which is a universal and known aspect) and this belief was the source of the essence of faith, particularly as subservience to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) can have many parts and aspects. At first, an aspect of faith, both as a part and individual component, it was commanded that *mu'mins* should get ready to fight and to lay down their lives. All bowed down before the command. The other detail of the command was in the form that they should lay down their arms and control their zeal. This was likewise most humbly accepted. It was for this purpose that *āyah* 4 of *Al-Fatḥ* was made to descend. It is obvious that here the increase in zeal could be in the context of "امنوا بالجملة ثم بالتفصيل" This statement has been made with the descent of two new commands. And therefore 'Allāmah Zamakhshrī's reproduction is appropriate and in keeping with the context.

We now come to another *āyah*; "...and We increased them in guidance." (Qur'ān, 18:13) وَزِدْنٰهُمْ هُدًى

This *āyah* has been quoted by Imām Bukhārī in support of his argument. This is because he believes guidance to be the very substance of faith and identical therewith.

The *Āyah* Explained

Let us first understand the *āyah* which is about the People of the Cave *Aṣḥāb al-Kahaf*. Romans had an emperor Daqyānūs (Decius) who was a tyrant and a pronounced pagan who forced his subjects to resort to idolatry. The generality of his subjects, fearing for their safety and hoping to obtain worldly gains, succumbed to his wish. But there was a small group of young men who still believed that it was not correct to displease the Creator for the sake of a mortal and the created being. Their hearts were full of fear of and guidance from God. God has bestowed on them the wealth of patience, perseverance, piety, and the desire to cut themselves off from the world. They went before the Emperor and demonstrated their power of conviction. The Qur'ān has thus narrated their declaration:

> Our Lord is the Lord of the heavens and the earth. We cry unto no god beside Him, for then should we utter an enormity. (Qur'ān, 18:14)

رَبُّنَا رَبُّ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضِ لَنْ نَّدْعُوَا
مِنْ دُوْنِهٖۤ اِلٰهًا لَّقَدْ قُلْنَاۤ اِذًا شَطَطًا (کہف آیت ۱۴)

That is to say, when He is the Lord of the heavens and the earth, naturally He would be the Creator, and therefore Divinity and Godhood are prerogatives which belong to Him alone. The people of the cave established through argument the unity of Godhood. And not this alone. They exposed the fallacy of those, who had renounced God and set in His place another deity. They demanded reasons for idolatry from idol-worshippers and called them irrational and unjust.

> Though they bring no clear warrant (vouchsafed) to them. And who doth greater wrong than one who inventeth a lie concerning Allāh. (Qur'ān, 18:15)

لَوْلَا يَاْتُوْنَ عَلَيْهِمْ بِسُلْطٰنٍۭ بَيِّنٍ ؕ فَمَنْ
اَظْلَمُ مِمَّنِ افْتَرٰى عَلَى اللّٰهِ كَذِبًا (کہف آیت ۱۵)

It is evident from the foregoing as to how munificent God had been in the vouchsafing to them of the power of perception and wisdom to a degree that they had not the least fear in such trying circumstances and were firmly stuck to their lofty faith and clung firmly to their concept and belief in the unity of God. They clearly said every thing. Consequently God said: "وزدناهم هدى" "We increased them in guidance". That is, God says that He vouchsafed to them greater sense and understanding. It is for the reader to decide whether the implication here is to increase in the essence of faith, as believed by Bukhārī or increase in auxiliaries of faith, e.g., perception, knowledge as is the creed of the Hanafites.

"And God increases His Guidance to those وَيَزِيْدُ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اهْتَدَوْا هُدًى that are rightly guided"; that is, those who through their efforts and persistance attain guidance, God bestows upon them the virtue to increase their guidance. Acts smacking of Godlessness prepare the ground for perpetuation of more Godless acts. By the same token acts of faith became a fair ground for the multiplication of faith. What Bukhārī has in mind is clear; but the meaning becomes all the clearer when the context of the *āyah* given below is examined.

By Excess of Guidance is Implied Continuation and Preservation of the Guidance itself

This *āyah* (verse) occurs in the Chapter *Al-Maryam* and is related to the preceding *āyah*:

> And, when Our clear revelations are recited unto them, those who disbelieve say unto those who believe: Which of the two parties (yours or ours) is better in position, and more imposing as an army ? (Qur'ān, 19:73)

وَاِذَا تُتْلٰى عَلَيْهِمْ اٰيٰتُنَا بَيِّنٰتٍ قَالَ الَّذِيْنَ
كَفَرُوْا لِلَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْۤا ۙ اَىُّ الْفَرِيْقَيْنِ خَيْرٌ
مَّقَامًا وَّاَحْسَنُ نَدِيًّا (مریم آیت ۷۳)

That is, the Infidels of Makkah on hearing the *āyāhs* (verses) in which has been pointed out the evil consequences of their deeds, laugh and say out of scorn and pride to the poor Muslims "You claim that the result of our deeds on the Day of Judgment will not be in consonance with our present condition and worldly position. Are our houses and furnitures and our mode of living not superior to yours? Is our society not more respectable than yours? Verily, we who according to you are prone towards evil are far more prosperous and powerful than you godly people. Let us therefore conceive about the future on the basis of our present respective positions." God has provided an answer to their contention as under:

> How many a generation have We destroyed before them, who were more imposing in respect of gear and outward seeming. (Qur'ān, 19:74)
>
> وَكَمْ أَهْلَكْنَا قَبْلَهُمْ مِّنْ قَرْنٍ هُمْ أَحْسَنُ
> أَثَاثًا وَّرِئْيًا ○ (مريم، آيت ٧٤)

There have been many nations in the past, who were far more prosperous in worldly affairs but, when they rose against the Prophets and made pride and arrogance their way of life, God uprooted them and effaced them from the map of the world. If this is the distinctive criterion, between the right and the wrong that a *mu'min* should be in a good position in the world, why then the Infidels were destroyed in the past, although they were far better off in worldly matters. This shows that the criterion between the right and the wrong is not applicable. Such examples have been mentioned at different places in the Qur'ān and God, after examining these questions and answers, says:

> Say: As for him who is in error, the Beneficent will verily prolong his span of life... (Qur'ān, 19:75)
>
> قُلْ مَنْ كَانَ فِي الضَّلٰلَةِ فَلْيَمْدُدْ لَهُ
> الرَّحْمٰنُ مَدًّا ج (مريم، آيت ٧٥)

Since the world is a place of test and trial, God sent his Prophets and books etc. in order that the path of evil and righteousness may be made clear to a man, so that man may choose the path of righteousness and avoid that of the evil. About this has been said: "وهديناه النجدين" "and it is the ladder to victory". No one has been absolutely made helpless but each individual has been given full freedom to act in his own way. Thus the law and management of God warrant that a person, having been shown the distinction between the right and the wrong should be left free to a certain extent to choose his own path which he has adopted according to his profession and intention. When, however, evil gains, through steady progress, the upper hand, the person is liable to a complete punishment whether in this world or in the next world. According to the said divine law, God says that He gives a person full latitude and keeps him completely astray when he, according to his profession and will, goes astray. That is he is then permanently deviated. And, in contrast, God says:

> Allāh increaseth in right guidance those who walk aright... (Qur'ān, 19:76)
>
> وَيَزِيدُ اللّٰهُ الَّذِينَ اهْتَدَوْا هُدًى (مريم، آيت ٧٦)

That is to say, those who deviate are given full latitude to persist in their deviation, while those that follow the laws of God out of their free will, and who imbibe the lessons of righteousness are endowed with increase in knowledge, perseverance, and stability. The meaning of "زيادة" and "هدى" means granting of perseverance, assiduity, and continuance. This is in contrast to those qualities as are associated with deviation. Therefore instead of the word "يزيد" the word "فليمدد" is a correct argument for this. It is for a man himself to decide whether it is increase in the essence of faith, as contented by Bukhārī, or the permanent consistency in faith and guidanae, which is among the auxiliaries of faith.

Those who are on the right path, God وَالَّذِينَ اهْتَدَوْا زَادَهُمْ هُدًى وَّآتٰهُمْ تَقْوٰهُمْ

enhances their guidance and they are gifted with piety by Him. This is one of the *āyahs* (verses) quoted by Bukhārī in which he has argued the increasing and decreasing of faith. We can make out the meaning of this *āyah* with reference to the previous context. It occurs in *sūrah Al-Muḥammad* which is alternatively called *sūrah Al-Qi-tāl*. This *āyah* is connected with the preceding one.

Among them are some who give ear unto thee (Muḥammad) (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) till, when they go forth from thy presence, they say unto those who have been given knowledge: What was that he said just now? (Qur'ān, 47:16)

وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَسْتَمِعُ إِلَيْكَ حَتَّى إِذَا خَرَجُوا
مِنْ عِنْدِكَ قَالُوا لِلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْعِلْمَ مَاذَا قَالَ
آنِفًا (محمد آيت ١٦)

Relationship between Organs and Natural Capacity

Let us try to understand a fundamental aspect through a natural analogy. It is a common observation that the constant disuse of an organ leads to its debility and ultimately to the total loss of power of that organ. If, for instance, a man keeps glued to his bed all the time and does not move his legs, it is obvious that a stage will come when he shall have lost the power to move his legs. We might say, as a matter of similitude, that if a person keeps in constant use his organs and parts of his body, regulating their employment through exercise and movement, upto a certain period, their power will be on the increase, as we see in the case of wrestler.

Such being the state of the corporal parts, would it not be possible to apply the same analogy to one's spiritual capacity and mental power? He who does not hear the words of righteousness, or if he does listen at all he does not try to understand them, or, even if he does understand them, he does not remember them, or, if he remembers them, he does not follow it, but on the contrary mocks and belittles the message and invariably he is bent on show of animosity, taunting and pride;—such a being shall have his mental capacity gradually stultified and his capacity to accept the message, of Righteousness, will be, as it were, obliterated. This is the state which the Qur'ān has designated as *khatm* (sealing). Such a being is rendered impervious to the Message and he shall be pursuing only his carnal desires and lust. The Qur'ān has said in this context:

Hast thou seen him who chooseth for his god his own lust. (Qur'ān, 25:43)

أَرَأَيْتَ مَنِ اتَّخَذَ إِلٰهَهُ هَوٰىهُ (فرقان آيت ٤٣)

In a *ḥadīth* concerning the disposal of trust it has been said:

Distinction between right and wrong ceases, and the only measure that remains is that of self-gratification.

فَلَا يَعْرِفُ مَعْرُوفًا وَّلَا يُنْكِرُ مُنْكَرًا إِلَّا
مَا أُشْرِبَ مِنْ هَوَاهُ

Contrary to this, a person who is ever disposed to lend ear to the Message of Righteousness, and tries to understand, remember, and to follow it, shall receive an impetus in the right direction and his insight, and luminosity of his faith and also his understanding in the right perspective will increase. His capacity to do virtuous deeds will also be enhanced. This theme has been elaborated in the Qur'ān with special reference to the Munāfiqīn (the Hypocrites) who would pretend to hear the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). But they neither tried to understand or remember what the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had said. Having left the assembly, they would ask the learned among the Muslims what the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) had said. The aim was thus to mock and belittle what was said by the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). Their contention is: We do not hold these statements to be of any import nor do we give any attention to it. The Qur'ān then goes on to describe their acts which show that their minds and hearts have been sealed. This would have no leeway for performance of virtuous and noble acts. All that remains is self-gratification. This is followed by a description of the beneficial effect of traversing on the path of righteousness. People who are prepared to accept the function of truth would gain correspondingly in knowledge and wisdom, and their piety and nobility will progress every moment. About such beings God says:

> While as for those who walk aright, He addeth to their guidance, and giveth them their protection (against evil).
> (Qur'ān, 47:17)
>
> وَالَّذِيْنَ اهْتَدَوْا زَادَهُمْ هُدًى وَّ
> اٰتٰهُمْ تَقْوٰهُمْ (محمدؐ، آیت ۱۷)

Call it what you will—excess of the essence of faith or auxiliaries of belief, e.g., religious perceptivity, nobility, and wisdom. Imām Bukhārī has cited the following *āyah* in support of his argument:

> ...and that believers may increase in faith. (Qur'ān, 74:31)
>
> وَيَزْدَادَ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْٓا اِيْمَانًا (مدثر آیت ۳۱)

This occurs in *Sūrah Muddaththir* and is related to the foregoing. Talking of hell, he says:

> Above it are nineteen.
> (Qur'ān, 74:30)
>
> عَلَيْهَا تِسْعَةَ عَشَرَ (مدثر، آیت ۳۰)

There will be nineteen angels designated as officers who will oversee administration of hell conducted by other angels. As for the question as regards the specificity of this number, we would only say that in matters of creation speculation is neither possible nor desirable. We cannot explain or describe the simplest matters pertaining to Creation. Again, Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz has described in great detail certain signification of the nineteen number. These are worthy of note. The sum of his explanation is that nineteen kinds of punishment have been prescribed in Hell, with each angel appointed to supervise one kind of punishment. And there is little doubt that an angel is very powerful, and he can perform tasks that are not liable to be performed even by millions of men together. But we must remember that an angel's nature of work is specific. The Angel of Death, for instance, can take life of hundreds of thousands of persons in a moment, but he cannot animate a child in the womb of the mother. The Angel Jibra'īl can, with amazing speed, bring *waḥī* but it is not for him to bring about rainfall. The ear cannot see, and the eye cannot hear; and, however difficult and seemingly impossible the task may be, each of them can cope up with their job. It is thus possible for the ear to listen to the voice compounded of thousands of voices and is not helpless; the eye can see many kinds of colours and yet it is not tired. By the same token, if only one angel were to be appointed upon those in Hell, there would have been only one kind of perdition. The other kind of perdition beyond his powers would not then have been possible. Therefore, for nineteen kinds of perdition (for details the reader is referred to the *Tafsīr-i-'Azīzī*) the corresponding number of angels has been determined. This point has been elaborated by many scholars, but I find Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz's explanation very thoughtful and satisfactory. This number was criticised by the ***Mushriks*** of Makkah. They were told:-

We have appointed only angels to be the wardens of the fire, and their number have We made to be a stumbling-block for those who disbelieve. (Qur'ān, 74:31)

وَمَا جَعَلْنَآ أَصْحٰبَ النَّارِ إِلَّا مَلٰٓئِكَةً ص وَّمَا جَعَلْنَا عِدَّتَهُمْ إِلَّا فِتْنَةً لِّلَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا لا (مدثر، آیت ۳۱)

This number has been made to be a yardstick for testing the deniers. The wisdom of the number lies in determining as to who shows fear of this number and who laughs it off. A *ḥadīth* has the description of a ***Mushrik*** wrestler who makes fun of the number. The second aspect of the wisdom of the number is:

...that those to whom the Scripture hath been given may have certainty. (Qur'ān, 74:31)

لِيَسْتَيْقِنَ الَّذِيْنَ أُوْتُوا الْكِتٰبَ (مدثر، آیت ۳۱)

Thus this number held significance for the People of the Book as well, and may result in the culmination of the earlier messages in celestial books, where the same number is mentioned. Apparently the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was *ummī* (unlettered) and had not acquired the knowledge of the earlier celestial books from any one (of the worldly tutors). And yet He gave mankind a thing that could have been possible through nothing except *waḥī* (revelation.) This is an irrefutable argument in favour of his Prophethood and the truth of the Qur'ān. The argument is so overpowering that even the opposing People of Book would not but acknowledge it and once the adversary acknowledges the puissance of the argument, the *mu'min* shall bloom with the flush of cheerfulness, pleasure, joy of faith, gladness, and liveliness. This would be the third kind of wisdom latent in the *āyah*. Having described the first two kinds of wisdom, the Qur'ān has stated the third:

...and that believers may increase in faith. (Qur'ān, 74:31)

وَيَزْدَادَ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْٓا إِيْمَانًا (مدثر، آیت ۳۱)

From what has been discussed in the foregoing, it is obvious that here it is the excess of the faith or the accessories of belief, e.g., joy of faith, cheerfulness, gladness, and liveliness, as in the incident of Prophet (Abraham) Ibrāhīm (علیه السلام) when he asked God how He gives life to the dead. The Qur'ān says:

Dost thou not believe? Abraham said: Yea, but (I ask) in order that my heart may be at ease. (Qur'ān, 2:260)

أَوَلَمْ تُؤْمِنْ قَالَ بَلٰى وَلٰكِنْ لِّيَطْمَئِنَّ قَلْبِيْ (بقرہ، آیت ۲۶۰)

The faith was there; and it was a very firm faith; he was a Prophet blessed with constancy and firmness. But he, nevertheless, believed that by actual observation his faith would have gained in a kind of excess based upon pleasure, joyousness, and satisfaction which is not a part of the faith itself but its accessory.

Besides, it was an intuitive message pertaining to mysteries or secrets where human intellect or power of reasoning cannot gain access. To acknowledge these tidings on the basis of the fact that they have emanated from a Prophet would be what would constitute proof of strength and solidarity of faith. This state has been equated with *ziyādat*. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's reply "آمنوا بالجملة ثم بالتفصيل" is also applicable here, for the *mu'mins* first started with the belief that they would testify to whatever message the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) shall bring. This was the abbreviated form of the faith subscribed to (It can constitute hundreds of thousands and millions of factors and parts.) A detail of the faith subscribed to (that is, a part thereof) was that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) through the Qur'ān gave the information that there would be nineteen overseers in Hell. *Mu'mins*, as soon as they heard the tiding, testified to this without questioning. Thus "آمنوا بالجملة ثم بالتفصيل" becomes applicable. When this was again expressed as, "ويزداد الذين آمنوا فزادتهم ايمانا" "and that believers may increase in faith", there are three replies contained in the *āyah*. The Qur'ān says:

Which one of you hath thus أَيُّكُمْ زَادَتْهُ هٰذِهٖٓ اِيْمَانًا فَاَمَّا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا فَزَادَتْهُمْ اِيْمَانًا increased in faith? As for those who believe, it hath increased them in faith. Qur'ān, 9:124)

Imām Bukhārī has quoted this *āyah* as well in support of his hypothesis.

Susceptibility is a condition to avail Benefit of Faith

The above quoted *āyah* is towards the end of *Sūrah Barāt* which is known also as *Al-Tawbah*. This *āyah* should also be understood in its proper context. But I should like to explain an analogy at first by way of introduction. It is proved by observation that even the best food will not act healthily on a person with defective system of digestion. Indeed, if anything, it would generate more malodorous and putrid matter. It is known to every person having some sense that the fault lies not in the food itself but in such an individual's system of digestion, otherwise, how is it that the stomach of a healthy individual is not affected adversely (by the same food)? The answer therefore lies in correcting the digesting system of that individual.

Once we have grasped this point it becomes clear that. God means by "واذا ما أنزلت سورة" "And whenever a *sūrah* is revealed" (in 9:124)—that, whenever a Qur'ānic *sūrah* was made to descend, the Hypocrites ridiculed it among themselves and said to the simple-minded Muslims of the day: "Which one of you has experienced increase in faith by means of this *sūrah*?" The underlying implication was (God forbid!) that there was nothing in a new *sūrah* that would increase faith and belief. The Qur'ān has countered this argument as follows:

As for those who believe, it hath increased them in faith and they rejoice (therefor) (Qur'ān, 9:124)

فَاَمَّا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا فَزَادَتْهُمْ اِيْمَانًا وَّهُمْ يَسْتَبْشِرُوْنَ ۝ (التوبہ آيت ۱۲۴)

The *mu'mins*, when, they hear the word of God, gain in comfort, tranquillity, and belief; their hearts are comforted and solaced. He again said:

But as for those in whose hearts is disease, it only addeth wickedness to their wickedness, and they die while they are disbelievers. (Qur'ān, 9:125)

وَاَمَّا الَّذِيْنَ فِيْ قُلُوْبِهِمْ مَّرَضٌ فَزَادَتْهُمْ رِجْسًا اِلٰى رِجْسِهِمْ وَمَاتُوْا وَهُمْ كٰفِرُوْنَ ۝ (التوبہ آيت ۱۲۵)

Thus the disease that has overtaken the hearts and the minds of the disbelievers would keep on growing till they finally die:

باران که در لطافت طبعش خلاف نیست   در باغ لاله رویدو در شوره بوم خس

(Rain, in the nature of which there is no contradiction, nevertheless, the tulips bloom in the garden, grass and mushroom grow in the unfertile soil)

Our example is in conformity with the Word of God in this regard. The words, *maraḍ* (disease) and rijs (pollution), denote a finer implication than appears on the surface. As for what possibilities exist in excess of faith, have been outlined by 'Allāmah Tha'labī who was a Malikite and belonged to Algeria. These three possibilities he has discussed in his *Al-Jawāhir al-Ḥisān* (Gems of Virtue).

Possibilities for the Excess of Faith

In the first place, every *sūrah* brings with it either newer concepts or more recent commands which are the details of the faith subscribed to *mu'min bihī*. When such *sūrah* descends and *mu'mins* believe, it is equivalent to "امنوا بالجملة ثم بالتفصيل" which has been called "زاد تهم" (increase). In the second place, every *sūrah* has new arguments and reasons, which, supported by a number of arguments, improves the belief in faith, comfort, solace, progress, intensity and power already possessed by the *mu'mins*· Thirdly, the new *sūrah* removes all the doubts that might make their way into the *mu'mins* heart as in *Ḥadīth* and puts the faith on a firmer ground.

(They said, "You should be afraid of فَاخْشَوْهُمْ فَزَادَهُمْ اِيْمَانًا وَّتَسْلِيْمًا them.") But this increased the faith in them. This *āyah* is from the *sūrah Al-e-'Imrān*. When Abū Sufyān returned from *Uḥd* to Makkah, he had second thoughts during his journey to Makkah about leaving the defeated and wounded Muslims. Consultations took place between the Makkans and it was proposed that the Quraysh army should march back to Madīnah and finish off the Muslims. When the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) learned about it, he announced that those who were with him in the war should now prepare themselves for the pursuit. The Muslim soldiery, although freshly wounded, came out, in the name of God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The Holy Prophet, with his party of *mujāhids* reached Ḥamarā al-asad, which is eight miles from Madīnah. When Abū Sufyān heard that the Muslims were in his pursuit, he was overcome by fear and awe. He gave up the intention to attack Madīnah again, and fled towards Makkah. Abdul Qays trade caravan was going to Madīnah. Abū Sufyān persuaded these traders through certain inducements that, as soon as they reached Madīnah, they should spread rumours in order to spread fear and awe among the Muslims. The people of Abdul Qays having arrived at Makkah, began to spread the rumour that the Makkans had prepared a great army and collected a great deal of weapons of war for destroying the Muslims. But the Muslims, when they heard it, instead of becoming awe-struck, became all the more zealous and firmer in their beliefs, and, having heard of the army of the Infidels, said: "حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل" (Allāh alone is sufficient for us! Most excellent is He in Whom we trust) to fight the whole world. The following *āyah* (verse) was sent on that occasion:

Those unto whom men said: Lo! the people have gathered against you, therefor fear them. (The threat of danger) but increased the faith of them and they cried: Allāh is sufficient for us! Most excellent is He in Whom we trust. (Qur'ān, 3:173)

اَلَّذِيْنَ قَالَ لَهُمُ النَّاسُ اِنَّ النَّاسَ قَدْ
جَمَعُوْا لَكُمْ فَاخْشَوْهُمْ فَزَادَهُمْ اِيْمَانًا ۖ وَّقَالُوْا
حَسْبُنَا اللّٰهُ وَنِعْمَ الْوَكِيْلُ (آل عمران، آیت ۱۷۳)

The implication, then is that the zeal of faith, confidence, and patience in the path of God had been gained among the Muslims that the Qur'ānic passage, "وقالو احسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل" "Allāh is sufficient for us! Most excellent is He in Whom we trust", argues plainly that what is implied here is the excess of faith as denoted by the auxiliaries or elevated stages of faith.

An Admonition

Some hold that Abū Sufyān, after the Battle of Uḥd, had announced that the Quraysh will fight a battle at Badr, the following year. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) accepted the challenge. When the year came, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) commanded his Companions to go for the *jihād*, and, if none went, he alone would go. Abū Sufyān came out, meanwhile, with his army from Makkah. But he lost courage after a little while. As he was overcome by awe, and, seeking pretext behind famine in Makkah, he wished to return. But he wished to arrange his return in such a way that it would be the Muslims who would bear the brunt of culpability. A person who was going to Madīnah was bribed by him for spreading rumours that would cause fear among the Muslims, so that they might not come out and attack the Makkans. Arriving at Madīnah, he began to spread the rumour that the Quraysh had accumulated a great force and battle was not in the best interests of the Muslims. But God had granted perseverance to the Muslims and they said: "Allāh is sufficient for us." The Muslims, as promised by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), reached Badr where a market used to take place. They made considerable profit from three days' trading and returned to Madīnah. This is known as Badr al-ṣughrā. Those who succoured the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) on this occasion and prepared for the battle were given the joyful tidings that they, having sustained wounds and losses at Uḥd, again showed such a great courage, that the Mushriks, overcome by the news of the Muslims' courage and sturdiness, returned in the midst of their march. The Makkans gave the expedition the name of *jaysh al-sawīq*, that is, the army that went to drink sawīq,[1] and returned having drunk it. But it is more probable that this *āyah* pertains not to Badr al-ṣughrā but to Ḥamarā al-Asad. Be that as it may, our case is proved. Imām Bukhārī presents another similar *āyah* by way of argument.

وَمَا زَادَهُمْ إِلَّا إِيمَانًا وَتَسْلِيمًا

That is, it increased their faith and resignation even more. This *āyah* is in the *sūrah al-Aḥzāb*. The Battle of *Aḥzāb* is also denoted as that of '*Khandaq*', and the *sūrah* pertains to it. This Battle is one that is testified to, in importance by its name, and history indeed testifies to it that the effort of the Infidels of Makkah and that of the whole Arabia had made it a point to give a last-ditch battle here, and, having been defeated in this battle, the pagans could never muster an army strong enough to challenge the Muslims, as is also narrated in the *Ḥadīth*. And the stronger expressions the Qur'ān has employed about the conduct of the Muslims have not been used, anywhere else, in relation to any other battle. When the firm Muslims saw that the forces of the Infidels had surrounded them on all the four sides, they did not lose courage or give way and the sentiments of their duty and obedience and their belief in God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) increased all the more. They said, "This is the occasion about which God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had foretold us and about which a covenant had been concluded". If a person who is held in esteem with regard to credibility gives a tiding in advance about the happening of a certain event, and we believe him unquestionably, and later on that happening does transpire, then would our faith in his credibility not be redoubled, and will our faith not gain all the more in belief and firmness? On the occasion of the Battle of the *Khandaq* the Muslims saw with their own eyes the fulfilment of the tidings and promises made by God and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم); their faith thereupon became more strongly rooted. Besides, as these tidings also implied victory, the sentiment of subservience increased thereby. They agreed with

---

[1] Sawīq is a meal of wheat, barley, or rice pounded, fried, and made into a liquid.

open hearts to follow the commands God has described thus in the following words:

> And when the true believers saw the clans, they said: This is that which Allāh and His messenger promised us, Allāh and His messenger are true. It did but confirm them in their faith and resignation.
> (Qur'ān, 33:22)

> وَلَمَّا رَاَ الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ الْاَحْزَابَ ۙ قَالُوْا هٰذَا
> مَا وَعَدَنَا اللّٰهُ وَرَسُوْلُهٗ وَصَدَقَ اللّٰهُ وَرَسُوْلُهٗ ۡ وَمَا
> زَادَهُمْ اِلَّآ اِيْمَانًا وَّتَسْلِيْمًا ؕ (احزاب آیت ۲۲)

The excess implied here is that which resulted from the fulfilment of the earlier promises and their confirmation, and from which resulted the joyousness, firmness of faith, and belief in the Promises of God. This is what amounts to an excess here.

Another Admonition

"هذا ماوعدنا الله ورسوله" "This is that which Allāh and His messenger promised us" The substance of this is described in the *sūrah Al-Baqar*:—

> Or think ye that ye will enter Paradise while yet there hath not come unto you the like of (that which came to) those who passed away before you? Affliction and adversity befell them, they were shaken as with earthquake, till the messenger (of Allāh) and those who believed along with him said: When cometh Allāh's help? Now surely Allāh's help is nigh.
> (Qur'ān, 2:214)

> اَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ اَنْ تَدْخُلُوا الْجَنَّةَ وَلَمَّا
> يَاْتِكُمْ مَّثَلُ الَّذِيْنَ خَلَوْا مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ ؕ مَسَّتْهُمُ
> الْبَاْسَآءُ وَالضَّرَّآءُ وَزُلْزِلُوْا حَتّٰى يَقُوْلَ
> الرَّسُوْلُ وَالَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعَهٗ مَتٰى نَصْرُ اللّٰهِ ؕ
> اَلَآ اِنَّ نَصْرَ اللّٰهِ قَرِيْبٌ ۝ (البقرہ، آیت ۲۱۴)

The implied purport is: Shall the law be changed for you? "بأساء و ضرآء" meaning "affliction and adversity" are external tribulations, whereas "زلزال" meaning "the depression of courage and ambition." Those who are less courageous dwindle, while in trouble, and consequently every one is affected. Even the Prophets and the devotees who kept waiting, reached the point of disappointment. But, at last, when they had almost lost their courage and perseverance, and were left with nothing, help from God appeared and positive results began to follow. They exclaimed! "هذا ماوعدنا الله ورسوله" "This is that which Allāh and His messenger promised us" (*Al-Aḥzāb*; *āyah* 22) finds another application in the *sūrah Ṣād*:

> A defeated host are (all) the factions that are there. (Qur'ān, 38:11)

> جُنْدٌ مَّا هُنَالِكَ مَهْزُوْمٌ مِّنَ الْاَحْزَابِ ۝ (صٓ آیت ۱۱)

Considered in context with, and in relation to the previous *āyāhs*, what this *āyah* seems to say is: "Nothing! What to speak of dominion over the sky and the earth and their treasures, these people are a community of defeated people which appears ruined like those We have destroyed before". This scene of gradual defeat and vanquishing was unfolded between the Battle of Badr and the Conquest of Makkah. Haḍrat 'Abd al-Qādir Dihlawī in this context writes: "That is to say, the earlier races were destroyed; and, if these (i. e., the Infidels) rise, they too shall be destroyed." The summary of the theme is that the clans shall be defeated, and, even if they challenge the Muslims, nothing else shall be their fate. They may, if they like, see it for themselves.

That is, it is a part of faith to love and وَالْحُبُّ فِي اللّٰهِ وَالْبُغْضُ فِي اللّٰهِ مِنَ الْاِيْمَانِ show enmity for God's sake. Bukhārī's argument seems to be obvious enough, since "من الايمان" (i. e., from *īmān* or faith) is an indication of faith being a complex whole and comprising parts. Therefore, faith will be liable to increase or decrease. Love and enmity, accordingly, admit of grades, such as the love of a person for his own son or for a stranger. When love and hate (e. g., hatred for the enemies of Islam) become parts of faith, they will be subject to increase or decrease. The Ḥanafites are, of course, free to answer that the implication is about the appurtenances of faith. But we have first to decide whether the statement is from a *ḥadīth* or is Bukhārī's own or something else. Bukhārī himself has not elaborated it. The word, *ḥadīth*, has been traced out from the *ḥadīth*, narrated by Abī Amāmah:

He who loves and bears hate for the sake of Allāh, he who gives away alms for the sake of Allāh and desists from doing so for His sake, shall have completed his faith,	مَنْ أَحَبَّ لِلّٰهِ وَأَبْغَضَ لِلّٰهِ وَأَعْطٰى لِلّٰهِ وَمَنَعَ لِلّٰهِ فَقَدِ اسْتَكْمَلَ الْإِيْمَانَ ؞

These words of the *ḥadīth* do not go against the Ḥanafites' belief; in fact, they support the Ḥanafite stand, as the word, 'استكمل' (completed), shows, as the love for the sake of Allāh and hatred for His sake are among the factors that make faith complete. This should show that they do not constitute the essence of faith. If, on the other hand, the statement is of Imām Bukhārī, the Ḥanafites are not required to give an answer thereto. In the event of the statement being of the *salaf* (the ancestors) we can see that it is an exegesis and the auxiliaries and the perfecting forms of faith.

'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz wrote to وَكَتَبَ عُمَرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيْزِ إِلٰى عَدِيِّ بْنِ عَدِيٍّ Ḥaḍrat 'Adī bin 'Adī. Ḥaḍrat 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz is known after the second pious Caliph, Ḥaḍrat 'Umar, as 'Umar the second. His justice and fairness are historically proved. We have the adage in Urdu, "such and such is so just and so wide is the effect of his justice that the goat and wolf drink from the same river bank". In our age this is but an adage, but in the caliphate of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar the second, such an incident did occur actually in the world. The scholars have said that, if all the cruel rulers of the nations earlier to Islam were to be placed in one pan of scale and Ḥajjāj bin Yūsuf in the other, it is Ḥajjāj who will prove to be the heavier. By the same token, if all the just rulers of the earlier nations are weighed against 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz, the latter will outweigh the former. He is one of the greatest followers of Companions. By a unanimous verdict, he is the first *mujaddid*, from the end of the first century and the beginning of the second.

It is obvious how great was the status of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz. Nevertheless, someone asked 'Abd Allāh bin Mubārak as to who enjoyed preference—Ḥaḍrat Amīr Mu'āwiyah or Ḥaḍrat 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz. This question was raised because some people had criticized Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah. 'Abd Allāh bin Mubārak's reply was: "What to speak of Mu'āwiyah, even the dust which had gathered round the nose of the horse on his way to *jihād* enjoys preference over hundreds of persons like 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz in the sight of God. 'Abd Allāh bin Mubārak then went to elaborate the reason for it: Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah had the privilege of offering prayers behind the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) and to say *Āmīn* (Amen) after the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) had recited: "اهدنا الصراط المستقيم" (Show us the straight path). In fact, the respect attained through the companionship of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is beyond expression.

There is an island which was known as Island of Ibn عدى بن عدى 'Umar (It is not 'Abd Allāh bin 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb, the famous Companion, but some other Ibn 'Umar by whose name this Island is known). It is called Mawṣal today. Actually, it is Mawṣal, but people began to call it Mūṣal. 'Adī bin 'Adī was the Governor of the Island on behalf of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz. It is the same Island round which the Ausyrian Nineveh was situated and where the Prophet Yūnus (عليه السلام) appeared. It is situated between Syria and 'Irāq. The actual words of the instruction which Ḥaḍrat 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz sent to 'Adī bin 'Adī were as follows : إنّ لِلإيمانِ فَرائِضَ وَشَرائِعَ وَحُدُوداً وَسُنَناً

That is, laws of the *sharī'ah*, statutes (*ḥudūd*), and *sunan* (Traditions of the Holy Prophet) (صلى الله عليه وسلم) are obligatory for faith. Some manuscripts have "ان الايمان" without "ل" (l). This manuscript should be more in Bukhārī's favour, for, with "ل" the nature of the auxiliaries and the perfecting factors become all the more evident, while without "ل" it is the integral nature that is more favourably argued. Be that as it may, we would say that the object is to make out the auxiliary nature of these, and the language of the epistle (which follows) supports our argument.

The purport is that فَمَنِ اسْتَكْمَلَهَا اسْتَكْمَلَ الإيمانَ وَمَنْ لَمْ يَسْتَكْمِلْهَا لَمْ يَسْتَكْمِلِ الإيمانَ whosoever has observed these requirements has fulfilled the demands of the faith, whereas one who has not fulfilled them has not fulfilled the demands of faith; "استكمل" means that, if the obligations, laws of the *sharī'ah*, statutory requirements, and the Tradition of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) are observed, *īmān* will be completed. These parts are not therefore obligatory but effective adjuncts of *īmān*. It has not been said that *īmān* shall be forfeited in their absence but that the perfection of faith is dependent upon them, and that perfection in the faith would be proportional to the practice thereof. From the epistle of 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz it appears plain enough that he has tended to regard these attributes as extraneous to the main body of the faith: he has not said that all these attributes are faith. We have already said that noble acts and pious environment constitute the perfection of faith, but the core of faith is that one compact reality, as made evident through the research of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah.

Obligations, *Sharāi'*, *Ḥudūd*, and the Tradition Explained

(i) *Farā'iḍ* (obligations):- These are the commands "فرائض" to be compulsorily observed, e. g., prayers, *zakāt*, fasting, and *ḥajj* etc.

(ii) *Sharāi'*.- By *sharāi'* are meant the principles which "شرائع" have been commonly accepted by all the Prophets, as borne out by the Qur'ān:

He hath ordained for you that religion which He commanded unto Noah, and that which We inspire in thee (Muḥammad) and that which We commended unto Abraham (Ibrāhīm) and Moses (Mūsā) and Jesus ('Isā), saying: Establish the religion, and be not divided therein. (Qur'ān, 42:13)

شَرَعَ لَكُمْ مِّنَ الدِّيْنِ مَا وَصّٰى بِهٖ نُوْحًا
وَّالَّذِیْٓ اَوْحَیْنَآ اِلَیْكَ وَمَا وَصَّیْنَا بِهٖٓ اِبْرٰهِیْمَ
وَمُوْسٰی وَعِیْسٰٓی اَنْ اَقِیْمُوا الدِّیْنَ وَلَا تَتَفَرَّقُوْا
فِیْهِ ؕ (شوریٰ آیت ۱۳)

Thus the principles which were transmitted to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) by the Lord were the same that were given to the earlier Prophets.

(iii) *Ḥudūdan*.- What do we mean by *ḥudūd*? There are "حدودا" three possibilities in this. The first is to maintain the practice and observe the laws of the *sharī'ah* from the beginning to the end. Thus about fasting it has been commanded:

...and eat and drink until the white thread becometh distinct to you from the black thread of the dawn. (Qur'ān, 2:187)

وَكُلُوْا وَاشْرَبُوْا حَتّٰى يَتَبَيَّنَ لَكُمُ الْخَيْطُ
الْاَبْيَضُ مِنَ الْخَيْطِ الْاَسْوَدِ مِنَ الْفَجْرِ (بقرہ آیت ۱۸۷)

In this *āyah* has been described the beginning of fasting. After that, an extract from the same *āyah* is:

Then strictly observe the fast till night fall. (Qur'ān, 2:187)

ثُمَّ اَتِمُّوا الصِّيَامَ اِلَى الَّيْلِ (بقرہ، آیت ۱۸۷)

In this sentence of *āyah*, the beginning and the end of fast has been explained. In other words, the fast becomes obligatory from the beginning of the month of *Ramaḍān* and ends at the end of *Ramaḍān*. "حدودا" "*Ḥududan*" therefore in 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Azīz's passage means that God has fixed a beginning and an end of His every command which has to be maintained.

The second implication of the word "حدود" "*ḥudūd*" is forbidding people against acts of punishment like, theft, adultery etc. religiously prohibited and their details are available in *Kitāb al-Ḥudūd*.

The third implication may mean all the prohibitions and observance of their limitations; that is to say, we can go to such an extent and not beyond that. To quote an instance for sexual satisfaction, God has given sanction for the wife and the lady slaves and has prohibited else than these. Whosoever exceeds the limit by a step, he is liable for committing prohibited acts. The Qur'ān says:

But whoso craveth beyond that, such are transgressers. (Qur'ān, 23:7)

فَمَنِ ابْتَغٰى وَرَآءَ ذٰلِكَ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْعٰدُوْنَ (مؤمنون آیت ۷)

Similarly, in *Ḥadīth* occurs the following prohibitions.

Every king has his own enclosure; the enclosure of God prohibits the entry of the prohibited acts.

وَاِنَّ لِكُلِّ مَلِكٍ حِمًى اَلَا اِنَّ حِمَى اللّٰهِ
فِىْ اَرْضِهٖ مَحَارِمُهٗ

The Qur'ān has alluded to this point on many an occasion, e.g.:

These are the limits imposed by Allāh, so approach them not. (Qur'ān, 2:187)

تِلْكَ حُدُوْدُ اللّٰهِ فَلَا تَقْرَبُوْهَا (بقرہ آیت ۱۸۷)

These are the limits (imposed by) Allāh. Transgress them not. For whoso transgresseth Allāh's limits, such are wrong doers. (Qur'ān, 2:229)

تِلْكَ حُدُوْدُ اللّٰهِ فَلَا تَعْتَدُوْهَا وَمَنْ يَّتَعَدَّ
حُدُوْدَ اللّٰهِ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الظّٰلِمُوْنَ (بقرہ آیت ۲۲۹)

In the *sūrah al-Nisā* (*āyah* 13) it has been said: "تلک حدود الله" These are the limits (imposed by) Allāh. In the succeeding *āyah* 14 it has been stated:

And whoso disobeyeth Allāh and His Messenger and transgresseth His limits, He will make him enter Fire, where such will dwell for ever; (Qur'ān, 4:14)

وَمَنْ يَّعْصِ اللّٰهَ وَرَسُوْلَهٗ وَيَتَعَدَّ
حُدُوْدَهٗ يُدْخِلْهُ نَارًا خَالِدًا فِيْهَا (النساء آیت ۱۴)

Everywhere prohibited and inviolable acts have been clarified by "تلک حدود الله" "These are the limits (imposed by) Allāh".

The lexicographic meaning of *sunnan* is the general mode of سنناً living and includes obligations, expedient, and salutary acts. Here generalization will be only after the specification of some points, and, as a matter of contrast, besides them, might mean only desirable and salutary actions.

Imām Bukhārī, in support of his theory of the increasing and decreasing of faith, quotes the *āyah* in relation to Prophet Abraham (Ibrāhīm) (عليه السلام):

..."but (I ask) in order that my heart may be at وَلٰكِنْ لِّيَطْمَئِنَّ قَلْبِيْ ease," (Qur'ān, 2:260). It would have been perhaps better if Imām Bukhārī had quoted this *āyah* in conjunction with those that have gone before and had not brought in, elliptically, the different statements and chronicles. But then it is just possible that this has been put in as an afterthought, since the word, *ziyādat*, is more expressly given in the other *āyāhs* but not here. The word, "ليطمئن" of course interprets it, and the passage for this reason has been quoted separately. This *āyah* presents some dubiety; it is therefore explained here with reference to the context.

And when Abraham said (unto his Lord): My Lord! Show me how Thou givest life to the dead. (Qur'ān, 2:260)	وَإِذْ قَالَ إِبْرٰهِيمُ رَبِّ أَرِنِيْ كَيْفَ تُحْيِ الْمَوْتٰى (بقره، آیت ۲۶۰)

A Detailed Explanation of ليطمئن قلبى

Doubt has arisen as to whether Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) had any doubt about the Omnipotence of Almighty God and for removal thereof he was asking this question. But such a doubt should have no foundation. Not only the most ordinary Muslims but even the infidels do not have any doubt. Hence it is not possible that an eminent Prophet of the calibre of Ibrāhim (عليه السلام) (the father of Prophets) could have any doubt in this respect (i.e. in the creative power of God).

Let us consider the precise words employed in the *āyah*. Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) is not asking God whether He raises the dead to life. He also does not ask how He makes the dead come to life. He only requests that he should see the dead rise again. The words employed are, "رب ارنى" "My Lord! Show me"; that is, "My Lord! Show the way how you accomplish this wonderful task."

Through the process of intuition it is known that when an extraordinary phenomenon takes place which brings to life a wonderful object which the eyes have never witnessed, a natural desire springs in the heart to witness the process through which the wonderful object has come to existence. Those who would like to see a thing or an object would wishfully say: "How happy would it be if I would see it" No one can doubt the actual existence of Makkah and Madīnah, but one who has not seen these two holy cities would like to know what they are like. He asks those who have performed *Ḥajj* to tell him about the two cities. The same thing applies to cities like London, Paris etc. whose existence is proved by over convincing reports and their existence cannot be doubted. Nonetheless, one would like to see them. A person is apt to ask about a place he has heard about and feels anxious to see or know more about it.

Only one, totally deficient in knowledge and thought, would say that such a question raises doubts about the existence of an unseen thing. Because of the belief already present about an object, visual fulfilment is desired, so that the mind may record the actual experience of observations felt by the eye.

Here also the same analogy obtains. 'Bringing the dead to life', is an extraordinary fact. The flesh and the bones, having decayed and putrefied are reassembled into a body. Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) had full belief and faith in the ramification of the dead. But what he wished was to see how this is brought about. Would it not have been a sight too wonderful to be described? When God, therefore, enquired: "اولم تؤمن" "Dost thou not believe?" (Qur'ān, 2:260), the Prophet's reply was "بلىٰ ولكن ليطمئن قلبى" "Yea, but (I ask) in order that my heart may be at ease" (Qur'ān, 2:260). That is, I have full belief, but I ask in order that the thirst of my curiosity may be satisfied. When one is burning with the desire to see a thing, he shall feel totally solaced once his desire has been fulfilled.

Distinction between Advice and Actual Observation

It is but human nature that something that is intellectually acquired or believed in, does not leave the same impression as when the thing is perceived by means of the senses. An instance of this distinction is provided in the incident about Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام). He went to the Mount of Ṭūr to bring the Torah. And God there informed the Prophet as under :

He said: Lo! We have tried thy folk in thine absence, and As-Sāmirī hath misled them. (Qur'ān, 20:85)

قَالَ فَإِنَّا قَدْ فَتَنَّا قَوْمَكَ مِنْ بَعْدِكَ وَ
أَضَلَّهُمُ السَّامِرِيُّ ۝ (طٰہٰ، آیت ۸۵)

God thus informed Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) that the Israelis had strayed from the right path and he certainly believed in the information given to him by Almighty God. When Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) returned to his people in rage, and saw with his own eyes that his nation was worshipping the (Golden) calf, Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) was overwhelmed with rage.

...he cast down the tablets, and he seized his brother by the head. (Qur'ān, 7:150)

أَلْقَى الْأَلْوَاحَ وَأَخَذَ بِرَأْسِ أَخِيهِ (اعراف آیت ۱۵۰)

We can see for ourselves that while Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) was bringing the tablets, he was sure that "اضلهم السامرى" "As-Sāmirī hath misled them", and that the false notions of the people had manifested themselves in the form of idolatry. As God had informed him about the straying away of the Israelites, he must have felt wrath towards his own people, but he was not so overwhelmed with anger as to throw down the tablets. But when he saw with his own eyes that the people were worshipping the Golden Calf he felt so infuriated that 'القى الالواح واخذ براس اخيه' "...he cast down the tablets, and he seized his brother by the head". The conclusion therefore is that any amount of surity by knowledge and wisdom cannot be equal to that acquired by observation. This point has been emphasized in the *Ḥadīth* also :

...that a news is not like observation.

لَيْسَ الْخَبَرُ كَالْمُعَايَنَةِ۔

In sum, the nature of the feelings established by observation cannot be gained by something that has not been actually felt even though the belief may have been acquired and confirmed by news and intellectual perception. This is proved from our intuitive knowledge and actual observation. Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) has said "ليطمئن قلبى" "that my heart may be at ease", about that extra feeling of satisfaction a man has after actually seeing an object, despite perfect surety and belief about its existence.

Rebuttal of false doubts about "رب ارنی" and "اولم تؤمن"

Some doubt that God's question, "اولم تؤمن" (Dost thou not believe) to Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام), suggests that Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) had doubt in his mind; otherwise he would not have put that question. But that doubt was totally false because when a man says that he can lift half a ton stone with one hand and if he is asked how he can do it, then, apart from other extraneous possibilities, the question could have two meanings; (i) the questioner's attitude of showing ignorance with the desire to see whether the man can practically do it, and (ii) the basis of curiosity, how he could perform such a wonderful deed. So that, when Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) asked God: "رب ارنی کیف تحیی الموتیٰ" "My Lord! Show me how Thou givest life to the dead", according to the situation, especially the elevated status of Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) the second meaning only should be applied here, as has been explained. But, since both the possibilities are there, a dullard could, considering only the apparent meaning, attribute the first implication to Prophet Ibrāhīm's question. (God forbid!) And it is God's attitude that He provides proof of immunity and defence against Prophets and their greatness in such a way that neither by word nor by deed, neither in appearance nor in reality could any doubt arise about them, for any reason and from any angle.

There is the incident concerning Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) which has been alluded to, in the Qur'ān:

Be not as those who slandered Moses, but Allāh proved his innocence of that which they alleged, and he was well esteemed in Allāh's sight. (Qur'ān, 33:69)

لَا تَكُوْنُوْا كَالَّذِيْنَ اٰذَوْا مُوْسٰى فَبَرَّاَهُ
اللّٰهُ مِمَّا قَالُوْا ؕ وَكَانَ عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ وَجِيْهًا ۝ (احزاب آیت ٦٩)

You should not do or speak anything that might harm your Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). For it would not affect him in the least for he has a great respect and status before God. He would remove all the hurdles created for him (Prophet). But your own life in the next world would be indeed spoiled. See how the people slandered Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام), but God, because of the Prophet's high and exalted status rejected every allegation and declared Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) guiltless and innocent. Some annotators have said Korah (Qārūn) bribed a woman to say before a crowd that (God forbid!) Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) had illicit relations with her. And God, as punishment, made Korah buried alive. This occurs in the *sūrah Qaṣaṣ*: "فخسفنابه وبداره الارض" So We caused the earth to swallow him and his dwelling-place. (28:81).

The same woman was made to repudiate her earlier accusation against Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام).

Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) contrary to the custom of the time, used to bathe secretly on account of modesty. People began to doubt that he had some physical defect. So one day the boulder on which Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) had placed his clothes rolled away and the people saw for themselves that his body had no defect. The Prophet's pursuit of the stone in his naked state was due to his helplessnes, and also probably because he did not believe that the stone would carry him in the midst of a crowd. This movement of the stone itself was a miracle, and such incidents should amply delineate how God has made the Prophets free from bodily and spiritual defects so that sentiments of hatred and dislike against them might not obstruct their messages from being accepted by God.

So here also, so far as Prophet Ibrāhīm's question is concerned, God, the Knower of all secrets, is fully aware that Prophet Ibrāhīm's question belongs to the second category, but, owing to the apparent alternative, a dullard or one deficient in knowledge and thought could ascribe to the question of the first category. But God Himself publicly proved the purport of Prophet Ibrāhīm's question. Once the nature of the matter is elucidated by the questioner and the questioned to, no doubt should arise. When therefore God put the question "اولم تؤمن" "Dost thou not believe?" that is, is it the sign of your infirmity to disbelieve in Our Omnipotence, that you wish it practically seen? The Prophet's reply was: "بلى ولكن ليطمئن قلبى" "yes, but I ask in order that my heart may be at ease". Why should I not believe? I have the fullest faith, but I wish to see the miracle with my own eyes due to great anxiety and curiosity. As this is miraculous, I want to see it, so that my restlessness caused by curiosity and fondness to see it, may be turned into comfort and consolation. God's question put to Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) although being aware of the nature of the Prophet's question is like the question that shall be put by Him to Prophet Jesus ('Īsā) (عليه السلام) on the Day of Judgment, as Qur'ān has said:

And when Allāh saith: O Jesus, son of Mary! Didst thou say unto mankind: Take me and my mother for two gods beside Allāh? (Qur'ān, 5:116)

وَإِذْ قَالَ اللّٰهُ يٰعِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ ءَاَنْتَ
قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُوْنِىْ وَاُمِّىَ اِلٰهَيْنِ مِنْ دُوْنِ
اللّٰهِ (مائده، آيت ۱۱۶)

God knows Prophet Jesus could not have said such a thing. And in the Qur'ān God the Almighty Himself has said:

It is not (possible) for any human being unto whom Allāh had given the Scripture and wisdom and the Prophethood that he should afterwards have said unto mankind: Be slaves of me instead of Allāh. Qur'ān, 3:79)

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ اَنْ يُّؤْتِيَهُ اللّٰهُ الْكِتٰبَ
وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنُّبُوَّةَ ثُمَّ يَقُوْلَ لِلنَّاسِ كُوْنُوْا
عِبَادًا لِّىْ مِنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ (آل عمران، آيت ۷۹)

So Prophet Jesus would explain his position as follows:

Be glorified! It was not mine to utter that to which I had no right. If I used to say it, then Thou knowest it. Thou knowest what is in my mind and I know not what is in Thy mind. Lo! Thou, only Thou art the knower of things hidden, (Qur'ān, 5:116)

سُبْحٰنَكَ مَا يَكُوْنُ لِىْ اَنْ اَقُوْلَ مَا لَيْسَ
لِىْ بِحَقٍّ ۭ اِنْ كُنْتُ قُلْتُهٗ فَقَدْ عَلِمْتَهٗ ۭ تَعْلَمُ مَا
فِىْ نَفْسِىْ وَلَآ اَعْلَمُ مَا فِىْ نَفْسِكَ ۭ اِنَّكَ اَنْتَ عَلَّامُ
الْغُيُوْبِ (مائده، آيت ۱۱۶)

What to speak of it, even any doubt in the heart is known to you.

I spake unto them only that which Thou commandedst me, (saying); Worship Allāh, my Lord and your Lord. (Qur'ān, 5:117)

مَا قُلْتُ لَهُمْ اِلَّا مَآ اَمَرْتَنِىْ بِهٖٓ اَنِ اعْبُدُوا
اللّٰهَ رَبِّىْ وَرَبَّكُمْ ۚ (مائده، آيت ۱۱۷)

The dullard or the erring might believe that perhaps Jesus (عليه السلام) had told the Christians to call him the son of God and that is why they worship him and his mother. Therefore on the Day of Judgement God through the aforementioned questions and answers will declare, in the presence of witnesses, Jesus (عليه السلام) innocent of all accusations by the Christians against him. And as the Qur'ān has already explained it, the advantage of having been cleared of all accusations is already there. In brief, according to Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام)

"ليطمئن قلبي" means the comfort and consolation acquired against restlessness created by anxiety and fondness to see thing with one's own eyes which is not acquired by intellectual perception although it may be a perfect surety. That can be determined only by actual observation.

You may interpret it as increase in the essence of faith or increase in the ancillaries of faith due to observation but Qur'ān apparently interprets in the right sense that it is something in addition to the faith as shown by the word, "لكن" (but).

He is the same Companion whose full name is Ma'ādh bin "وقال معاذ" Jabal about whom the *ḥadīth* runs: "اعلمكم بالحلال والحرام معاذ" that Ma'ādh knows more than anyone of you about what is permitted and what is prohibited. He asked his friend, Aswad bin Hilāl who is regarded as one of the great followers of Companions:

"Sit with me a little while so that we may refresh اجلس بنا نؤمن ساعة our faith." The meaning is that a man indulged in worldly affairs becomes more or less negligent but by discussing matters concerning God, the negligence is removed and the faith appears with increased light. For instance, there is a flame but it is covered by ash. Its glow is hidden because of the ash, but, if ash is removed, its glow will appear itself again. The same thing holds good for utensils which, when cleaned, become bright again. This analogy may, likewise, be applied to the light of faith, effulgence of which becomes dim through negligence. The light again appears when recitation of God spells darkness of negligence. The Qur'ān has thus described the fact.

Lo! those who ward off (evil), when a glamour from the devil troubleth them, they do but remember (Allāh's guidance) and behold them seers. (Qur'ān, 7:201)

إِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ اتَّقَوْا إِذَا مَسَّهُمْ طٰٓئِفٌ مِّنَ
الشَّيْطٰنِ تَذَكَّرُوْا فَإِذَا هُمْ مُّبْصِرُوْنَ (اعراف آيت ۲۰۱)

Distinction between the negligence of the Pious and the negligence of the Impious

It is not impossible for a pious man to come under the influence of the Satan. And Satan may misguide him but the position of the pious is such that they do not indulge permanently in the negligence due to the misguidance of Satan. No sooner did they become negligent than they come to their senses immediately by reciting God. Thus they became conscious about the results of good and bad which made them abstain from evil deeds. In contrast to this, the impious, having no fear of God, enter, so to say, into the satanic fraternity. The Qur'ān describes their condition as under:

Their brethren plunge them further into error and cease not. (Qur'ān, 7:202)

وَإِخْوَانُهُمْ يَمُدُّوْنَهُمْ فِي الْغَيِّ ثُمَّ لَا
يُقْصِرُوْنَ ۝ (اعراف آيت ۲۰۲)

The Satans thus hold such a strong grip over the impious that they are kept under their permanent straying. The impious, on their side, do not display any laxity in following them. The distinction between the pious and the impious can be understood from the analogy of two persons, one of whom is totally blind, while the other has the gift of full sight, but is overcome by drowsiness. Just as the blind person cannot see, so cannot he who is feeling drowsy. But there is a world of difference between the two. We might shake the blind one to any extent he will not be able to see. If you shake a drowsy person even slightly, he shall open his eyes.

This analogy would make out the distinction between the believer and the non-believer. The believer also may be liable for negligence and may also commit sins. But the state of the believer is like that of the drowsy person; only drowsiness is the veil that keeps him deprived of the sight. But in a short while, if he himself wakes up or some one else shakes him up, his eyes open, and he can see everything. The believer may, at times, fall victim to the strategy of Satan and commits a sin, but he himself comes to senses or some one else makes him conscious that he remembers God and again makes beliefs his guideway. He is wide awake again. Such is the dignity of *mu'min*. As for the unbeliever (*kāfir*), he is like a blind man. You may shake him, or even hammer him, he cannot open his eyes.

The above discussion has also elucidated the meaning of the following *Ḥadīth*: "لایزنی الزانی حین یزنی وهومؤمن" An adulterer does not commit the act of adultery while he is a *mu'min*.

It does not mean that the *mu'min* loses his *īmān* altogether, but due to the sin he has committed, the *mu'min*, under the influence of sensuality and doubts cannot perceive those things which he could perceive with the help of his *īmān*. But still he is not blind while an infidel is blind. The *ḥadīth* towards the end says that *īmān* is like a canopy over his head while he commits adultery. It does not leave him; although it is with him, it is displeased with and distracted from him; therefore it leaves him from inside. That his faith deserts him and forms canopy over his head, not moving in any other direction is a mystery which Shaykh Akbar has written that it is a great favour of God upon the sinner, that at the time of committing sin he became liable for the Wrath of God. It is very probable that he would be subjected to curse of God or any heaven-sent punishment. It is for this safeguard that faith deserts him from within and forms canopy over his head. Praise be upon God from whom flow Compassion and Favour.

In short, Ḥaḍrat Ma'ādh implies that indulgence in the affairs of the world has made us neglect God. He says, "Let us remember God and renew our faith." This renewal of faith may, again, be regarded as increase in the essence of faith or the light of faith after dispelling negligence. This also refutes the contention of the Murjites and the like thinkers, who regard acts having nothing to do with the belief. Ḥaḍrat Ma'ādh considers discussion on faith as *īmān*. Thus it is proved that acts have association with faith and consequently they increase faith.

That is, Ibn Mas'ūd says "complete belief وَقَالَ ابْنُ مَسْعُوْدٍ اَلْيَقِيْنُ الْاِيْمَانُ كُلُّهٗ is complete faith." Bukhārī takes recourse to this argument to prove that actions are necessary for faith and they are the basis for increase and decrease in faith since a thing that comprises different parts would admit increase and decrease. Bukhārī depends on his argument on the word, "*kull*" (a perfect whole) consisting of parts. Had Imām Bukhārī mentioned this statement in full, it would have been much better. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has reproduced this statement in full from Ṭibrānī.

Patience is half the faith and belief is *īmān* in full. اَلصَّبْرُ نِصْفُ الْاِيْمَانِ وَالْيَقِيْنُ الْاِيْمَانُ كُلُّهٗ،

The word, half, testifies to the intent of Bukhārī. But Bukhārī is in the habit of testing the minds of the people and has, therefore, described one aspect only: what he implies, however, is the total effect. He gives a hint to us to investigate into the matter ourselves. The words "الیقین الایمان کلہ" apparently imply that faith is the name of belief only.

Verbal affirmation and acts have no concern with it. This is identical to the Jahmīyah creed, and hence it is necessary to elucidate it. If, on the other hand, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah says "الايمان المعرفة" it would be considered sinful to expound his statement and he is straight away associated with the Jahmīyah creed. If someone else speaks like this, interpretations are readily available to support him.

Complete belief saves one from sins

Belief, here does not mean absolute belief, but its that stage which mystics attain after excessive prayers, severe exercise in devotion and exertions in defence of faith. Belief has distinctive grades: "علم اليقين، عين اليقين، حق اليقين" Belief by knowledge, Belief by observation (proved as broad daylight) and Belief by reality (essence of faith). After these are attained, there is a very little possibility of committal of sins. It would be in a very rare case, if at all. A person may not be innocent, but he is, at least, protected from the committal of sins, for how can a person commit a sin after attaining complete belief? If a person knows that his box or water-pot contains a snake, he would not put his hand in any one of them. Likewise, if a man knows that it is fire and its function is burning he will not touch it. Only those would touch it who are unaware of how fire works. Thus one who believes in the characteristics of God, in the sense of His curse, by way of having acquired complete belief, by way of knowledge and observation, shall not commit such an absurd type of sin. It is about this kind of belief that Haḍrat Ibn Mas'ūd says that it constitutes perfect faith: it is not directed against the Hanafites in any manner. There are many other factors that go to make faith; the controversy is regarding what constitutes the essence of faith.

Ibn 'Umar says that a وَقَالَ ابْنُ عُمَرَ لَا يَبْلُغُ الْعَبْدُ حَقِيقَةَ التَّقْوَى حَتَّى يَدَعَ مَا حَاكَ فِي الصَّدْرِ devotee cannot reach the zenith of piety unless he renounces a thing that pricks his conscience. The tenor of the argument on the part of Bukhārī is evident that piety is faith, and from this statement it should emerge that there are some *mu'mins* higher in rank because of higher piety than those who are lower-graded in piety. Thus there are higher and lower degrees of faith. The passage implies, of course, that the real stage of piety and its reality are beyond the reach of man until he abstains from things that prick his conscience. But then again pricking of conscience would be felt by him alone whose conscience is clear; while it does not matter for a man who does not care for what is permitted and what is prohibited.

The Reality of Piety

What is piety? The twin feelings of the fear of God and renunciation of acts having detrimental consequences constitute a state which may be called piety. The basic thing, of course, is the fear of God. Once a person becomes God-fearing he will abstain from the acts which have detrimental effects. Now there are many kinds of harmful elements, such as poison, which is toxic, and therefore injurious. Then there is a thorn which is harmful too. Nevertheless, there is a considerable difference between the two.

Degrees of Piety

The first grade of piety is that a person should abstain from infidelity (*kufr*) and polytheism (*shirk*) which are deadly poisons. The next degree is that of abstaining from innovations, the third is abstaining from major sins. The fourth is avoiding minor sins, for these, too, to an extent, constitute sins. The fifth is avoidance of the permitted pleasure the excessive indulgence in which would lead one to do the prohibited acts. Tirmidhī has narrated a *ḥadīth* to this effect.

No person can appreciate the reality of piety unless he renounces the permitted things with the fear that he should be edicted to prohibited acts.	لَا يَبْلُغُ الْعَبْدُ حَقِيقَةَ التَّقْوٰى حَتّٰى يَدَعَ مَا لَا بَأْسَ بِهٖ حَذَرًا مِّمَّا بِهٖ بَأْسٌ

For example, "اكل وشرب" "eating and drinking" are absolutely permitted acts, but excessive indulgence in them might lead one to negligence which is the root-cause of sin. The sixth one is to be free from suspicions. These are the six degrees of piety in order of merit. All *mu'mins* abide by some of them. But the mystics believe that there is, in addition to these, one more grade which requires the pious man to abstain absolutely from the objects other than God; that is to say, even if the thing is permitted, he would desire the acquiescence of God in all he does. If he goes to his wife, he does some thing that is lawfully right and he has Divine sanction to satisfy his sexual desires. Even then he should keep in mind that God has permitted him to do so and on the contrary he should not indulge in the prohibited acts. While using his hands, feet, ears, and nose in any action, he should, all the time, keep God and His Grace in mind. It is probably this aspect that has been emphasized in the *ḥadīth* :

What seest thou if he keeps them entangled in what is interdicted.[1]	أَرَءَيْتَ لَوْ وَضَعَهَا فِي حَرَامٍ

As for the Hanafites, what their reply would be is that for the Hanafites the essence of faith is one thing and piety another, and the latter comprises numerous grades.

وَقَالَ مُجَاهِدٌ شَرَعَ لَكُمْ مِّنَ الدِّيْنِ مَا وَصّٰى بِهٖ نُوْحًا أَوْصَيْنَاكَ يَا مُحَمَّدُ وَإِيَّاهُ دِيْنًا وَّاحِدًا

Mujāhid in his explanation of the passage, "شرع لكم من الدين ما وصى به نوحا" said the purport of the words is as follows: "Muḥammad! to thee, and to the Prophet Noah, (Nūḥ) (عليه السلام), We entrusted the same religion. In some copies occurs "انبياء" in place of "اياه" Whatever be the case, Bukhārī's implication here is that on the basis of Mujāhid's explanation, the *āyah* implies that the religion given to all the Prophets is identical, and it is virtually certain that there have been some subtractions and additions in the principles and regulations of each *sharī'ah* (religion). From this it follows that faith accepts excess or detraction, and this is the reason why, despite this excess and reduction, each of the religions given to the Prophets is being called identical. Religion and faith, in Bukhārī's approach, are identical, from which it is proved that faith also increases and decreases. For the Hanafites the reply is simpler, as the identity of faith and religion is something that is in line with Bukhārī's approach; the Hanafites do not subscribe to this identity,

قَالَ ابْنُ عَبَّاسٍ شِرْعَةً وَّمِنْهَاجًا سَبِيْلًا وَّسُنَّةً

Ibn 'Abbās says: 'لكل جعلنا لكم شرعة ومنهاجا': that is, the laws of Islam and the Islamic code of life are the Islamic path and practice. "شرعة" means sabīl (a road, highway) and "منهاج" means a narrow pathway, that is, the *sunnah*. "شرعة" means a wide road for general passage, while "منهاج" means a narrow pathway. The meaning that emerges is that each *ummah* has been allotted a different path. Here the meaning is that both are identical, but the discrete nature of each *ummah*, nevertheless, cannot be ruled out. "شرعة" means a wide road which is open to all. From this wide road would emanate all those principles and the fundamentals which are common to all religions and *sharī'ah* and which have been equal for all the followers of the religions, e.g., monotheism, the Day of Judgment, Resurrection, etc. "منهاج" means a pathway over which all do not travel. By "منهاج" are therefore implied those offshoots of commands as were peculiar to each religion. There were many commands that were parts of the *sharī'ah* of these religions, but they now stand annulled.

---

[1] This Tradition of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) is in reply to a question in which it was asked how we should be requited for acts that are in accordance with our desire and needs. The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) replied that if the involvement of the bodily organ into prohibited acts can lead to Retribution, why should the doing of what is permitted not result in Requital.

The point would consequently be that there are two kinds of commands in every *sharī'ah* and religion: (i) Some of them are those that are fundamentally constitutional, are common to all the *sharī'ahs* and religions, and which are meant for common practice; and (ii) some are such commands as were promulgated keeping in view the specific nature of the age and circumstances and which, being specific and not universal, were superseded by the following *sharī'ah*.

Both these points of view need no explanation. What, however, is Bukhārī's line of argument? Some have held that the statements of Mujāhid and Ibn 'Abbās do not constitute complete arguments in themselves, if taken singly. But, if both statements are combined, an argument does emerge, because from Mujāhid's statement it would be seen that the religions of all the Prophets are the same, while from Ibn 'Abbās's statement it would appear that there is difference in command in each of them, and addition and subtraction have occurred. An interpretation of the two statements, when combined together, would indicate that there is increasing and decreasing in religion. Some, on the other hand, have said: "No, there has been no change. Each religion or *sharī'ah* is on a permanent footing."

This is analogous to Mujāhid's way of thinking who has said that the religions of all the Prophets are identical and it is an established fact that each *sharī'ah* has undergone changes. And Ibn 'Abbās's statement has that each religion has been given special *sharī'ahs* and commands. It is a fact that the religion of all the Prophets is the same and, summing up, we might say that the meaning of a statement is understood if it is supported by a well-reasoned commentary.

This is the commentary of Ibn 'Abbās which has a دُعَآؤُكُمْ اِيْمَانُكُمْ contextual relationship with the following Qur'ānic *āyah* (verse):

Say (O Muḥammad, unto the disbelievers): My Lord would not concern Himself with you but for your prayer.
Qur'ān, 25:77)

قُلْ مَا يَعْبَؤُا بِكُمْ رَبِّيْ لَوْلَا دُعَآؤُكُمْ (الفرقان آيت ٧٧)

Prayer here does not mean ordinary prayer for a particular purpose, but prayer in the absolute sense, which includes "لا اله الا الله". It is only by way of submission that a man prays to any higher authority for the fulfilment of his desires. Consequently praying to God is a kind of supplication, and for this reason absolute prayer has been called prayer here. The meaning of the *āyah* is, however: "If you have not called Him, He would have no concern with you." This is the content of *ḥadīth* in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim:* "لا تقوم الساعة حتیٰ لایقال فی الارض الله الله". The Last Day will not come as long as there will be some one to say: oh God ! oh God !".

From this it is clear that invocation to God is the essence (soul) of the entire cosmos. Bukhārī's argument, however, is that prayer, which is an act, has been regarded as faith. The Hanafite approach is summed up in the statement: "لا تحجير فى الاطلاقات فان فيها توسعاً" "There should be an ample scope in the interpretation. It should not be narrowed".

If the interpretation of prayer, according to the commentary of Ibn 'Abbās is taken as faith, God the Almighty admonishes that what He takes into consideration is not the embarrassing circumstances of a man when he prays to God for His mercy but it is *Īmān* due to which He directs special favour to the believers of faith. If the person lacks in *Īmān*, there is no question of special favour and mercy from God. Ibn 'Abbās has translated "دعا" "prayer" as faith, since "الدعاء مخ العبادة" "prayer is the kernel of worship." Prayer enjoys great position in faith, and has therefore been equated with faith. This would refute the claims of the Murjites and the Karamayites who regard acts in relation to faith to be ineffective and unconnected. Mawlānā Anwar Shāh believes that, if prayer is given the meaning it ordinarily conveys, then what we get in this context is not the conventional prayer but cries from the innermost depth of the heart, full and undivided attention towards God, and extreme supplication. Such a cry comes out at times of extreme adversity from the infidels and non-believers as well as may be seen in the following verse of the Qur'ān.

And if a wave enshroudeth them like awnings, they cry unto Allāh, making their faith pure for Him only. (Qur'ān, 31:32)	وَإِذَا غَشِيَهُمْ مَّوْجٌ كَالظُّلَلِ دَعَوُا اللّٰهَ مُخْلِصِينَ لَهُ الدِّينَ ۚ ۵ (لقمان، آیت ۳۲)

The meaning is that God is compassionate to you because you call Him and turn towards Him in supplication. It cannot be denied that the prayers even of the infidels are heard and their wishes granted in the form of worldly benefits on account of their repentance and charity. Nevertheless this will not redeem them from hell

A Glance at the Arguments of Imam Bukhari

The interpretation and the direction of the arguments of Imām Bukhārī concern the Mutazilites and the Murjites, while the Sunnites are in between. Some of the Sunnites are, however, closer to the Murjites while some to the Mutazilites. This was the analysis given by Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan. But, if one ignoring this point, believes that Imām Bukhārī has adopted the view of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, then one should like to question Imām Bukhārī as to why he has disputed Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's view on the matter of faith. The interpretation given by him is about the sentence that Islam is based upon five principles. The point at issue is, therefore, relates to the fact of the waxing and waning of faith, but the arguments given in its support lead not to faith, but to Islam itself. Thus at some places it is devotion that is discussed, at others the excess or lack of piety. We do not dispute the point that piety and devotion can wax and wane. That action or deed is a part of Islam we do not deny, but the argument by Imām Bukhārī that the nature of faith increases or decreases is not proved.

Imām Bukhārī has made fifteen observations in support of his argument, all of which we have explained and the reader can appreciate the nature of argument involved.

7. We were told by 'Ubayd Allāh bin Mūsā that Ḥanẓalah bin Abī Sufyān informed us quoting 'Ikramah bin Khālid, who reported.

✶ Ibn 'Umar as saying that the Apostle of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) declared that :

"Islam is based on five (cardinal principles)". (i) the testimony that there is no God save Allāh and that Muḥammad is His Apostle; (ii) regular and proper performance of prayers; (iii) payment of *zakāt*; (iv) performance of *Ḥajj*; and (v) fasting during the month of *Ramaḍān*.

۷۔ حَدَّثَنَا عُبَيْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ مُوْسٰى قَالَ اَخْبَرَنَا
حَنْظَلَةُ بْنُ اَبِیْ سُفْيَانَ عَنْ عِكْرِمَةَ بْنِ خَالِدٍ عَنِ
ابْنِ عُمَرَ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
بُنِیَ الْاِسْلَامُ عَلٰى خَمْسٍ شَهَادَةُ اَنْ لَّا اِلٰهَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ
وَاَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ وَاِقَامُ الصَّلٰوةِ وَاِيْتَاءُ الزَّكٰوةِ
وَالْحَجُّ وَصَوْمُ رَمَضَانَ۔

Imam Bukhari's view according to the *Ḥadīth*

The aim of Imām Bukhārī is to establish, through this Tradition, that faith is susceptible to increase or decrease. These five pillars of faith are not such as to be found in their complete form in every person, as some would be irregular in their prayers, others lax in payment of *zakāt*, and still some more in matters concerning fast and *Ḥajj*.

Offering of prayers, payment of *zakāt*, observance of fasting, and pilgrimage to Ka'bah—all these are the elements of the observance of Islam, and they do not find generally their complete action in each one of us. With the degree of difference attendant upon the laxity in the practice of these obligations, distinction does appear in the overall degree of faith. A man's acts and observances show his devotion to the cause of faith, but, if he flags in observance and practice, this deficiency would indicate the lack of belief and faith. Imām Bukhārī has quoted Ibn 'Umar to show that the lack of excess of observance leads to an increase or a decrease in faith.

The purpose of this interpretation has been to بُنِیَ الْاِسْلَامُ عَلٰى خَمْسٍ show that the edifice of Islam is raised on five pillars. Imām Bukhārī has already put together into chapter headings the different verses of the Qur'ān; the parts of relevant Tradition, various statements, impressions and memorabilia, in support of his argument. Thereafter he has quoted direct Tradition from Ibn 'Umar that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said that the edifice of Islam stands on five pillars. Thus Islam has been likened to an edifice which requires five pillars on its support. Just in the same manner as a tent would require five pegs to stand, one pole in the centre and the other four pegs on the four corners. This pole in the centre has the support of the other four pegs by means of ropes. Without the pole in the centre which is called the prop, the tent will not stand, even though the remaining pegs are intact. The same analogy applies exactly to the five principles of Islam. The affirmation of the unity of God and of the office of the Prophet corresponds to that of the propping pole and pivot on which Islam stands. And the prayer, the *zakāt*, the fasting and the *Ḥajj* are like the auxillary pegs. If the central pole—that of affirmation—of the unity of God and of the prophethood undergoes tremor or doubt, the remaining adjuncts would become useless. But this central thing if remains intact, then no matter whether the supporting adjuncts survive or not, Islam shall remain. However, if one pillar falls down the rope on that side will become loose and become impaired, no doubt, but it will remain.

This would show that not all the five pillars belong to the same grade. This is illustrated by an incident involving the famous poet, Farzduq, and Ḥasan of Baṣrā, a great saint, both of whom attended a funeral. Ḥasan of Baṣrā asked Farzduq: "When all of us have to die some day, what preparations have you made for the Hereafter?" Farzduq replied: There is no better formula than the affirmation of the unity of God and that Muḥammad is His servant and messenger.

Replies Ḥasan Baṣrī: "There is no doubt that this is the "عمود" "central pillar"; where are the pegs and the ropes whereby the tent is set up?"

The disorder of words in the *Ḥadīth*

There has been also an element of change in the arrangement of the five pillars of faith "امور خمسه". Imām Bukhārī here has arranged the narration according to the report of Ḥanẓalah who heard it from the narrator who comes between himself and Ibn 'Umar. In this mode of narration *Ḥajj* has been given precedence over fasting . On the other hand, the narrative in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is a little differently arranged. It gives precedence to fast during the month of Ramaḍān and treats of pilgrimage (*Ḥajj*) afterwards.

It is, however, certain that the arrangement of the words in the saying of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is either one or the other, and that which is not the word of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is the word of the narrator. In reporting where sense is preferred to the original from, such alteration in the arrangement of words is quite common. Change in the arrangement of words does not spell out any significant alteration in the real meaning. Wherever such changes in the narration of the reporters occur, it is very difficult to pinpoint what the actual words of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) here or there were. Fortunately, however, an incident has come to our help in determining the real arrangement of the words. When 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar uttered "صوم رمضان و الحج" as reported in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, a person who heard this narrative transposed it as follows: "الحج وصوم رمضان" "*Ḥajj* and fasting during the month of Ramaḍān", as in the narrative of Bukhārī, Ibn 'Umar thereupon objected to this transposed version and said:

"Nay ! fasting during the month of Ramaḍān and *Ḥajj*." As this is the order of precedence I heard from the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).
(*Fatḥ al-Bārī*, Vol. I, p. 56)

لَا صِيَامُ رَمَضَانَ وَالْحَجُّ هٰكَذَا سَمِعْتُ
مِنْ رَّسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ (فتح الباری ص ٥٦ ج ١)

Thus, it is the explicit narrative in which fasting precedes *Ḥajj* in the actual utterance of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). Otherwise Ibn 'Umar would not have contradicted this order and would not have said, "هكذا سمعت الخ" "I have heard this...". Bukhārī's narrative is, therefore, a presentation of the sense and meaning while that of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is an exact reproduction of the original words, as it explains what was actually heard from the lips of the Apostle of God (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

The secret of precedence of fasting in narration

The shaykh (spiritual guide) of Imām Nawawī, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ṣalāḥ, has said that this denial of the precedence on the part of Ibn 'Umar can constitute an argument for the conjunctive letter "و" "and" as a measure of arrangement as we find in the views of many Shafiite jurists and some grammarians. As those who deny "واو" as the measure for arrangement, such as the Hanafite doctors and grammarians, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has reproduced the rejoinder of Ibn Ṣalāḥ on their belief. Ibn Ṣalāḥ says Ibn 'Umar's denial is not with regard to "واو" fixing the order of precedence, but because in rhetoric and eloquent compositions there is some underlying point in the procedure of words—which words should precede others.

Consequently, about "ان الصفا والمروة من شعائر الله" "Indeed, *Ṣafā* and *Marwah* are signs of Allāh", the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) during his walk between *Ṣafā* and *Marwah* said: "نبدأ كما بدء الله" "We shall also begin where God began His (message)". This means that the order of precedence is not devoid of some significance. In much the same way, even though the precise order of fast and *Ḥajj* is not subject to the arrangement of the conjunctive word "واو" "and", nevertheless, since the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) had put fasting before *Ḥajj*, there must have been some latent point. And this point is: "fasting was ordained obligatory in 2 A.H. and *Ḥajj* in 6 or 9 A.H." Thus fasting precedes *Ḥajj* in order of promulgation; it should naturally precede in description. In the incident we have just quoted the person who confused this order, also reversed the chronological order. This is why Ibn 'Umar refuted this version. The second reason could have been that, although the narration did convey the purport of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), for purposes of narration, as far as possible, there should be the fullest adherence to the exact words of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). Whatever, however, might have been the reason for denial by Ibn 'Umar of the version put before him, the reason for according precedence to fasting is in accordance with the reason why the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) put fasting before pilgrimage, and which has since been reproduced by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar from Ibn Ṣalāḥ—namely, the descent of the obligation of fasting is earlier and of *Ḥajj* later.

The Order of the Precedence of Fasting and Pilgrimage in the Qur'an

We have hitherto confined ourselves only to the arrangement of fasting and *Ḥajj* in the narration of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). When we refer to the Qur'ān, we find that the same arrangement obtains here as well, that is, firstly, it is the obligation of fasting which has been explained and secondly (in the same *sūrah*), that of *Ḥajj*. The description of fasting commences from the beginning of the sixth *rukū'* in: "پارہ سیقول".

O ye who believe! Fasting is prescribed for you, even as it was prescribed for those before you. (Qur'ān, 2:183)

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الصِّيَامُ
كَمَا كُتِبَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ (بقره آیت ۱۸۳)

The whole of the *rukū'* is full of commandments apropos of fasting: only towards the end does a command concerning means of subsistence not properly earned, follow.

And eat not up your property among yourselves in vanity. (Qur'ān, 2:188)

وَلَا تَأْكُلُوا أَمْوَالَكُمْ بَيْنَكُمْ بِالْبَاطِلِ (بقره آیت ۱۸۸)

The context of this *āyah* is in continuation of the promulgation of the obligation of fasting in the sense that the month of Ramaḍān is the month of abstinence from acts that are permitted. Abstinence from things or acts that are interdicted is not of a temporary but permanent nature. In the seventh *rukū'* the theme of the *āyāhs* gradually shifts towards the obligation of *Ḥajj*:

They ask thee (O Muḥammad), of new moons, say: They are fixed seasons for mankind and for the pilgrimage. (Qur'ān, 2:189)

يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْأَهِلَّةِ قُلْ هِيَ مَوَاقِيتُ
لِلنَّاسِ وَالْحَجِّ (بقره آیت ۱۸۹)

At first it is the moon that figures in the command regarding the twin obligations of fasting and pilgrimage, which depend on the appearance of the moon. Therefore a preliminary hint and an allusion have been made to the moon in the words: "قل هی مواقیت للناس" "they are fixed seasons for mankind" followed by a more specific exposition of "والحج" "and for the pilgrimage". Then, in the same verse, the rites associated with *Ḥajj* during the period of Ignorance are not only rescinded but they are also given a reformatory character:

It is not righteousness that ye go to houses by the backs thereof (as do the idolaters at certain seasons), but the righteous man is he who wardeth off (evil). So go to houses by the gates thereof.
(Qur'ān, 2:189)

وَلَيْسَ الْبِرُّ بِاَنْ تَاْتُوا الْبُيُوْتَ مِنْ ظُهُوْرِهَا
وَلٰكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنِ اتَّقٰى وَاْتُوا الْبُيُوْتَ مِنْ
اَبْوَابِهَا (بقرہ، آیت ۱۸۹)

This is followed by the commandment to slay without temerity the enemies of Islam who take the initiative in declaring hostilities against the believers.

And fight not with them at the Inviolable Place of Worship until they first attack you there, but, if they attack you (there), then slay them. Such is the reward of disbelievers. (Qur'ān, 2:191)

وَلَا تُقٰتِلُوْهُمْ عِنْدَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ
حَتّٰى يُقٰتِلُوْكُمْ فِيْهِ ۚ فَاِنْ قٰتَلُوْكُمْ فَاقْتُلُوْهُمْ ؕ
كَذٰلِكَ جَزَآءُ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ (بقرہ آیت ۱۹۱)

The next theme is to observe equality in the observance of mutual respect and obligations. Should the enemy transgress the limits of obligations and be inclined to hostility, then ye should also ignore all obligations and take to arms.

The forbidden month for the forbidden month, and forbidden things in retaliation. And one who attacketh you, attack him in like manner as he attacked you.
(Qur'ān, 2:194)

اَلشَّهْرُ الْحَرَامُ بِالشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ وَالْحُرُمٰتُ
قِصَاصٌ ؕ فَمَنِ اعْتَدٰى عَلَيْكُمْ فَاعْتَدُوْا عَلَيْهِ
بِمِثْلِ مَا اعْتَدٰى عَلَيْكُمْ ص (بقرہ، آیت ۱۹۴)

Makkah had been the abode of peace from the time of Prophet Ibrāhīm (علیه السلام). Nobody did even question his adversary, if he happened to meet him in Makkah. Further the four months specially known for peace were, *Dhī al-qa'dah*, *Dhī al-Ḥajjah*, *Muḥarram* and *Rajab*. In *Dhī al-qa'dah*, A.H. 6, the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم), accompanied by his Companions, journeyed to Makkah to offer '*umrah*. No sooner did he reach the environs of Makkah than the disbelievers got ready to give battle, and thereby prevented the Muslims from offering '*umrah*. A compromise formula was reached after parleys, and it was decided that the Muslims should postpone their visit to Makkah this year but they would be allowed to offer '*umrah* the following year. When, however, the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) decided to offer '*umrah*, the following year (A.H. 7) the Companions expressed doubt about the people of Makkah lest they should back out from their commitment; and in that case what their line of action would be. If they were forced to fight, then how it could be possible to do so in Makkah as well as in the month of peace. And if they did not fight, then how they would perform '*umrah* on this occasion.

The commandment of God came as a revelation that the Muslims should treat this month *Dhī al-qa'dah* and this year like last year in its inviobility when the disbelievers stopped the Muslims from performing '*umrah*. But if the disbelievers again stop the Muslims contrary to the last year's agreement, the Muslims were enjoined to fight a defensive war in support of last year's agreement, for both parties are committed to observe inviobility and respect for the holy place. The meaning, in other words, is that in the city of peace and during the inviolable month war is permitted in sheer self-defence. This theme is associated with *Ḥajj* since there is the possibility that the pilgrim would be prevented by the disbelievers when he starts for *Ḥajj* and this actually happened at the small village of Ḥudaybiyyah. The existence of such a possibility could not be ruled out and thus to prevent the Muslims from withdrawal, an explicit commandment was revealed to overcome these difficulties.

In the following verse (195) God has commanded: "وانفقوا فی سبیل الله" "Spend your wealth for the cause of Allāh" (Qur'ān, 2:195). This verse completed the commandment about *jihād* by laying down that you must spend on promoting the cause of *jihād*, and do not endanger your lives by giving up *jihād* or by not spending money for its cause, otherwise the Muslims would become weak and the adversary more puissant. "انفاق فی سبیل الله" "disbursing in the cause of Allāh" could also be related to *Ḥajj*. Commandments concerning *Ḥajj* and *'umrah* follow after the ancillary aspects of pilgrimage have been described:

Perform the pilgrimage and the visit (to Makkah) for Allāh. (Qur'ān, 2:196)

وَاَتِمُّوا الْحَجَّ وَالْعُمْرَةَ لِلّٰهِ (بقره، آیت ۱۹۶)

Commandments pertaining to *Ḥajj* run from this verse down to the verse 200. Preparations for war in the path of God is followed by the commandment concerning *Ḥajj*, because the qualities required in war should first be expressed in practice by every Muslim during *Ḥajj* e.g., separation from those near and dear ones, farewell to one's home and hearth, sufferings during journey, simplicity in garments and victuals, disbursement of money in the path of God; punishment if the commandments are transgressed as to prescribed limits, obedience of different representatives of the Muslim world to one general leader, and deliverance from the petty feuds and living in unity of body and soul. Such qualities generate firmness, courage, ability to face adverse situation, sacrifice, and readiness to surrender one's life in the cause of faith. The verse "لا رفث ولا فسوق ولا جدال فی الحج" "(Let him remember that) there is (to be) no lewdness nor abuse nor angry conversation on the pilgrimage" (Qur'ān, 2:197) has these reforming tendencies as its object. It is, therefore, intended that one should start on the journey for *Ḥajj* purified by reform of the soul and by maintenance of high moral values so that these noble attributes may not be adversely affected in one's relation to God.

Importance of Chronology

The question that might arise here is that, if practice and observance are implied, there are many other commandments and obligations, that require expatiation, e.g., *jihād*, affairs of the state and the people and rights of people, etc. Some have come out with the suggestion that the aim here is not to enumerate and detail all the different commands, but only to mention the principal obligations, having the position of the pillars of faith. Others have said that the object is to allude to all the kinds of worship and to take one example as a representative of its kind. There are several kinds of worship. One is the oral kind; it is called verbal affirmation by tongue and belongs to this category; it also includes worship associated with other members of the body. And this falls into two broad divisions :

(i) where the renunciation and abstinence from a thing is enjoined i.e. Fasting.

(ii) The second division is again divided in three sub-divisions:

(a) those that pertain only to material wealth, e.g., *zakāt*.
(b) those that are (concerned with the body) e.g. fasting and,
(c) those that are associated both with the body and wealth like *Ḥajj*.

Thus all kinds of worship have been mentioned. It is now proper to give an account in some detail of every pillar of the five pillars of the faith so that the readers may know their true significance.

The First Doctrine

The first doctrine of Islamic faith is *shahādat* or testimony. *Shahādat* stands for *īmān*, as the very meaning of *shahādat* is to express orally what the heart has acknowledged. It is because of this that the statement of the Hypocrites "نشهد انک لرسول الله" "We indeed testify that you are Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) of God" was rebutted by the Word of God, "ان المنافقین لکذبون" "Verily the Hypocrites are liars." They were adjudged liars because they did not have truth on their side.

A doubt may arise here, and doubt there certainly is, having not been attended to, by any of the exegetes, nor have I come across any writer who has given the problem the attention it deserves. When no one visualises the possibility of the doubt, the question of resolving the doubt does not arise. The late Mawlānā Anwar Shāh once in the course of a discussion raised this question and himself provided the answer. The doubt is as follows: In any formula or heading pertaining to *shahādat*, where there is description of the unitarianism, it is followed by the mention of the Prophethood as in the first doctrine of faith. When, however, there is no heading or formula for *shahādat*, we, only, see Monotheism being emphasized through "لا اله الا الله" "There is no god but Allāh" and not *risālat*, namely, "محمد رسول الله" "And Muhammad is His Messenger", as in the Tradition of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم):

He who has said, "There is no god but Allāh, has entered Paradise." مَنْ قَالَ لَآ اِلٰهَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ دَخَلَ الْجَنَّةَ

Here only the unitarianism has been mentioned, not Prophethood, although the latter is also implied. On the same analogy.

The recitation of the name of Allāh is the best of all recitations. اَفْضَلُ الذِّكْرِ لَآ اِلٰهَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ

What is the difference in the application of these two modes? The point to be noted is that the object of *shahādat* is to express faith by heart. "لا اله الا الله" has two possibilities. Sometimes its aim is the expression of faith in the sanctum of his heart. At other times the aim is not to ventilate the faith but to only mention the name of Allāh, as in the case of *ṣūfīs* who recite it hundreds and thousands of times. By the same token *subḥān Allāh* "Praise be to God", *al-ḥamdu lillāh* "Thanks be returned to God", and Allāh! Allāh! are recitations of different kinds. In the same manner "لا اله الا الله" is a kind of recitation, the constant repetition of which results in the eschewing of every thing that is besides God and a constant employment of the praise of Almighty God, so that succour is sought only from God, His Power and Omnipotence are accepted by the heart, and this association may be maintained to the end. It is generally accepted phenomenon that, if a thing is constantly on one's lips, it is bound to have its effect on the heart. This is what is known as "اذا تکرر تقرر" "A thing, oft repeated, becomes firmly entrenched." A felicity of this *kalimah*, moreover, is that its light and blessings are stamped on the heart.

Rejoinder to Ibn Taymiyah on ذکر مفرد

The recitation of the Name of only Allāh *mufrad* for the mystics is a kind of recitation. Ibn Taymīyah, in his "فتاوی", has objected very vigorously to its use. He has called it meaningless and innovation. Ibn Taymīyah holds that compound recitations, such as 'سبحان الله' 'الحمدلله' and "لا اله الا الله" comprise the same meanings, e.g., sanctity and holiness of God etc. As for 'Allāh, Allāh', this recitation offers neither "اثبات" "positiveness" nor "تنزیہ" "purification", nor the subject, nor the predicate. Thus it is a mark giving no sense. A person may say Zayd! Zayd! thousands of times; it would have no meaning whatsoever but for the mystics, such a repetition is recitation. In fact, some have special characteristics attached to such a recitation. Ibn Taymīyah is undoubtedly a very great scholar, but it is rather surprising that he does not understand the fact that, if considered on this analogy, "اذکار مرکبہ" "compound recitations" in which he himself believes, such as *Subḥān Allāh*, *Al-ḥamdu Lillāh*, etc. would also be devoid of any significance. If a man, nay, the whole world keeps on repeating *subḥān Allāh*, would such a recitation add to the purification and holiness of God? Certainly not; considered thus, such a recitation would also make such a repetition superfluous and vague. But, in reality, these recitations (God forbid)—are not to visualize God in a position whereby He would derive advantage from human beings or to add something to His already limitless and ineffable Magnificence, since this is impossible. The aim is that the reciter should have the concept of the Magnificence, Grace, Perfection and Majesty and gain firm belief in his heart, and that His remembrance should become an essence of the heart and be with him all the time. Such a close association with God would lead to the obviation of neglect in this behalf, as it is such neglect that it is the root-cause of sins and allurements offered by Satan. Not only the recitations but the main purpose of all prayers, exercises in devotion and exertions in defence of faith is that the created ones should have connection with the Creator, there should be no negligence in the least and this object is achieved also through the recitation of Allāh! Allāh.

Thus, again the meaning of the word, Allāh, is also as follows: "ذات واجب الوجود مستجمع لجمیع صفات الکمال" His Person is self-existent, the Collector and the Collection of all Attributes of Grace and Perfection. We have also earlier referred to a *ḥadīth* quoted in Muslim: "لا تقوم الساعة حتے یقال فی الارض الله الله" Here Allāh! Allāh! is by way of recitation and this is why it has been repeated. Were it only faith, it would not have been necessary to emphasize this repetition. The apparent purport denotes a *mu'min*, for it is the *mu'min* who recites the Name of God.

Comment on Imam Ghazali's Argument

Imām Ghazālī has established the "ذکر مفرد" by the following *āyah* of the Qur'ān:

Say: Allāh. Then leave them
(Qur'ān, 6:92)

قُلِ اللّٰهُ ثُمَّ ذَرْهُمْ (الانعام آیت ۹۲)

Here the imperative verb, "قل", has as its determined object to speak out Allāh, which is simple, not compound. This argument is, however, theoretical, as it is the answer to a question, but, if combined with the numerical nature of the subject, it is compound.

Imam Abu Hanifah and Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq on Ism Al-A'zam

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah considers "Allāh" as the emanation of "اسم اعظم" "The Great Name". The word has been given a very high and elevated rank in the *ḥadīth*. But what Imām Abū Ḥanīfah means is not that recitation of Allāh to be "اسم اعظم" that you and we do which has been given so important a position. What Imām Abū Ḥanīfah means is something different. Imām Ja'far Ṣādiq was once questioned by a person as to what اسم اعظم is. He said: "Come with me, and I shall tell you what it is." He took him to the bank of a river, and asked him to get down into it. The questioner began to descend into the river. Ultimately he sank to the level of his nose. Not knowing how to swim, he became very nervous, thinking he would sink. He called Imām Ja'far Ṣādiq and requested him to give him his hand and to support him. Ja'far Ṣādiq caught him by the hand and said: "If you call God in the same state in which you found yourself just now, the word will be "اسم اعظم". In the real sense it is quite probable that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah meant that supplication to Allāh when overcome by a peculiar condition of the heart is "اسم اعظم". Recitation of Allāh! Allāh! all the time is not "اسم اعظم".

Back to the topic again

Our discussion has hitherto revolved round the two possibilities in "لا اله الا الله". One possibility is that of expressing faith, the other of only reciting. On the contrary "محمد رسول الله" "Muḥammad is Prophet of Allāh" is an assertion of faith. No one has taken it to be mere recitation. *Durūd*, of course, carries blessings (*thawāb*) and is a recitation in so far as it is a prayer for the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). It is therefore something different. The instruction of the mystics to the reciters to the effect that, while reciting "لا اله الا الله" the reciter should include "محمد رسول الله" also in-between, is not because it is also recitation but only because "لا اله الا الله" may not absorb the reciter so much that in consequence his belief in Prophethood may become weak and he start attaching no importance to Prophethood. This weakness also amounts to *kufr* (infidelity), and hence the clause testifying belief in Prophethood should also be repeated.

Arkan Arba'ah Explained

If we look at the subservience shown by one person to the other, we would see that it comprises two kinds. In the first kind subservience is offered because of the possibility of affliction of pain and loss or because of danger that lurks lest he loses the benefits of ease and comfort which he enjoys presently (this is the kind of subservience displayed by the subject towards the ruler and by the servant towards his master through the fear that he may lose his advantages and be afflicted with pain). If he transgresses the command of his master, he would lose his employment and risk the confiscation of his salary and this kind of subservience is on the footing of the master-servant relationship. The second kind is based upon love and is due to affection of the heart, e.g., the love felt by the lover towards his beloved. This subservience is because of love. Such subservience is called "محبوبیت".

The Magnificence of God and *Maḥbūbīyat*

Both these attributes demanding subservience to the maximum limit belong to God, because it is beyond any doubt that the whole of the cosmos and all that exists in it are created objects. The Creator of all things is God, and the absolute rule belongs to Him. That all the Attributes of Virtues and Graceful characteristics beyond the pale of any contention also belong to Him. Whatever virtue or excellence we see in any person or object is His reflection. We would therefore have to concede that absolute *maḥbūbīyat* is also for Him. When any person therefore submits to belief, he has to start with the assumption that God is his Absolute Master and his Real Beloved. The Qur'ān has delineated the attribute of a *mu'min* as follows:

Those who believe are the stauncher in their love for Allāh, (Qur'ān, 2:165) وَالَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْٓا اَشَدُّ حُبًّا لِّلّٰهِ (البقرہ، آیت ۱۶۵)

When both kinds of subservience are focussed on God, to the utmost limits of perfection, it is but obvious that every kind of subservience is meant for God. Should anyone be made a co-sharer and recipient of subservience, we would be like a servant who belongs to one master but serves another, or like people who are subjects of one ruler but obey another, or like a lover who pines in the memory of someone other than his beloved. It is obvious that such a treacherous servant deserves instant dismissal, such people are worthy of punishment, and such a lover only deserves to be driven out instead of being rewarded.

Ṣalāt and *Zakāh*

Ṣalāt and *zakāh* are both manifestations of the Absolute suzerainty of God and of man's total subjugation to His Will especially the former which stands predominantly. *Zakāh* follows in principle.

The Reality of *ṣalāt* in the Light of its Components

Once we closely examine the different components and commands associated with *ṣalāt* (prayer) we find that we have before us a detailed example and design of God's suzerainty and man's subjugation. There are different forms which the ruler-subject relationship can assume. At times it is the courtiers who are called by the ruler and at others the people themselves approach the king with a supplication. Sometimes it also happens that, if called by the ruler, the subjects go with an application to him. It is the third form which is obvious with the prayers, here man is called to present himself before Him by God Himself.

Explaining the Words Used in the Call for Prayer

In the beginning it was commanded through the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) when the worshippers should offer prayers. It was quite possible that, getting entangled into worldly affairs, the invitation is likely to be forgotten. God, out of His Munificence and Compassion, extended to man another call when the time for prayer draws nearer in the form of a proclamation. This proclamation is *adhān* (call for prayer). How full of wisdom, logically arranged, and symmetrical are the words of *adhān*! It commences with the proclamation of the Greatness of God "الله اكبر". This is followed by the announcement of the Unity of the Godhead so that all the supplication has to be made in His Court. This is "اشهد ان لا اله الا الله" "testify there is no other god except Allāh". This testimony having been proclaimed, we have the testimony about the Apostlehood of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) from whom we learnt the etiquette to be observed before the Ruler and who showed us the etiquette to be followed. This is "اشهد ان محمدا رسول الله" "I testify that Muḥammad is the Apostle of God". The call reminds us that the moment whereupon we have to present ourselves before our Ruler and Sovereign has arrived; we must prepare and transport ourselves thither. This is "حى على الصلوة". We are then told that the Sovereign who is calling us to His Court does not stand to derive the slightest benefit from our presence. This presence is only for our salvation and benefit. This is "ـى على الفلاح". Finally, the Greatness and the Magnificence of God is again emphasized through words that make an impression on the mind, and the Attributes of the Unity of the Godhead, Magnificence, and Omnipotence are refreshed. Once the Command to present ourselves in His Court has been sounded, we have to prepare ourselves to be there.

Etiquette Prescribed for Presenting Oneself before God

When elaborate preparations are made and extraordinary attention is paid to personal cleanliness when attending worldly rulers, it is befitting that a person should present himself before his Creator in a clean and pure state, both with regard to the body and, as far as possible, to his clothes. This is what is known as the purification of the body and the clothes and is *wuḍū* (ablution). The Qur'ān says:

Look to your adornment at every place of worship. (Qur'ān, 7:31)

خُذُوْا زِيْنَتَكُمْ عِنْدَ كُلِّ مَسْجِدٍ (الاعراف، آيت ٣١)

Now that we have been given the call to attend to our Master, we move towards His Court: in our material world the Courts of God are the mosques. God, being free from the limitations of space and dimensions, we do not—(God forbid!—) imply that God has manifested Himself in the mosques but that God has graced them in a manner which we do not find in other places. The analogy of the sun and the mirror we have already discussed earlier in respect of *'arsh* also applies here. This is why it has been ordained that mosques should be kept clean and held in utmost reverence.

(This lamp is found) in houses which Allāh hath allowed to be exalted and that His name shall be remembered therein.
(Qur'ān, 24:36)

فِيْ بُيُوْتٍ اَذِنَ اللّٰهُ اَنْ تُرْفَعَ وَيُذْكَرَ
فِيْهَا اسْمُهٗ (النور، آيت ٣٦)

Buyūt[1] here means mosques. Now all have gathered in the mosques but presentation before the Ruler postulates certain modes of comporting oneself and the respect paid to such places is, in fact, the respect paid to the Ruler, otherwise there are thousands of houses that stand unattended to. The etiquette of the Court demands that the right foot be placed first in the mosque and we should desist from spitting, shouting etc. within its precincts. The two *rak'āhs* of *sunnah* offered in the mosque are a part of this overall etiquette. This discussion should remove the misunderstanding that this prayer is for the mosque, not for God.

Thus, it is clear that the mosque's call to the people inviting them to prayer is a worldly aspect while the prayer is actually attributed to God and not to the mosque.

Another aspect of the Audience Chamber of the Ruler is that the seating arrangement of the courtiers is rank-wise and bear numbers, and it is but natural that those who are higher in rank sit close to the Ruler, and the rest behind them according to their respective ranks. But one thing that we observe is that usually those who gather before others do not give any importance to the numbering of the seats. On the other hand, they gather progressively according to "كيف ما اتفق" "Seats available". When the courtiers have collected and the appointed moment is close, the call that the court begins is sounded; and that all should take their seets. It is *Iqāmat* and they should stand for prayers fulfilling the purpose of *Iqāmat*. And for this, *adhān* adds "قد قامت الصلوة" which means that the court is about to commence and it is in consonance with:

---

[1] *Buyūt* is the plural of *bayt* (house).

Near me, in the first row, should stand the adults and the wise. لِيَلِيَنِي مِنكُمْ أُولُو الْأَحْلَامِ وَالنُّهَى

This is the etiquette of the arrangement of the rows.

Reverence due to the Direction of *Ka'bah* (*Qiblah*)

An honourable aspect of the Audience Chamber is that all the courtiers should devote their attention to their Ruler with utmost concentration. No person can turn his back to the Ruler and face another direction.

Since God is not to be governed by the dimensions of space, we can pay reverence to Him only through submission worthy of his exalted honour representing His light like mirror in this world and this is *Ka'bah* which, as the special place of His Illumination, is known as *Bayt Allāh* (The House of God). It has, therefore, been ordained that all should face *Ka'bah* and direct their attention and devotion in that direction. This is "استقبال قبله" "reception accorded to *Qiblah*".

The Grandeur of the office of Imam of prayer

The person presenting himself in the Audience Chamber would like to have someone who would plead his cause. Such a person would be one who is pleasing and acceptable to the Ruler and he should have the same request as the person whom he is representing. He should be one who would present his case along with his own in the shape of a single consolidated request in the hope that the request of the suppliant would be acceded to, along with his own. A person who is closer to the Ruler is likely to have his petition acquiesced to, and, since the request of the petitioner is linked to the latter's supplication, there is all likelihood that the petitioner's request would be accepted. It would be ungenerous indeed that several persons should combine to present a joint request and that the request of some should be granted and of the others refused. With God, the ultimate in compassion and generosity, such a treatment in His Audience Chamber is impossible. Also, sometimes the presentation of a joint supplication by many becomes the cause of excessive Generosity and attraction of the compassion of God. There is an endless number of such sciences and affairs which are in the Knowledge of God, and indeed even greater affairs. In His boundless Wisdom He prescribed *jamā'at* (gathering for prayers).

Stretching this analogy further, we see that the etiquette of the Audience Chamber demands that silence should reign supreme. If, for example, a hundred people present themselves in the Chamber and their request is identical, it does not happen that they should be asked to present the petition individually, but the etiquette requires that one capable person should be chosen to represent the case. The rest should remain quiet behind him, and hear him present their supplication.

An Imām for leading the prayers is appointed for the reasons which we have enumerated in the above paragraphs. There are *aḥādīth* which point to the lofty position of the Imām. Thus in the following *ḥadīth* commencing with: "النهى عن التفل الى جانب القبلة فى الصلوة" "Do not spit, while praying, in the direction of *Qiblah*" occur the words, "ان ربه بينه وبين القبلة" Between the *Qiblah* and the person offering prayers are present the Manifestations of God.

This would but imply that *Qiblah* carries towards it the special manifestations of God. It is because of this that it has been prescribed that the Imām should stand in precedence to all others in the direction of *Qiblah* and not behind them.

Once these matters have been decided, all the worshippers would now verbally affirm the Greatness of the King of the kings by physically touching their ears. They would express their disgust and severance from all that is besides God, and engage themselves with the task of submission to the Ultimate Ruler. This is *takbīr taḥrīmah*. When the worshipper has raised his hands up to his ears, he has made the suggestion that he has relieved himself of all that is besides God and has relegated all of it to the background.

It is habitual for a man expressing his disgust or dislike for anything, he denies his association with it by lifting his hands. It is then generally said that he has decided to relinquish that object or thing, that is, he has renounced it and dissociated himself totally and utterly from it. Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn ibn al-'Arabī (Shaykh Akbar), has, because of this, said that between the raising of the hands and joining them together again, the worshipper should slow down his movement for a little while, so that he may make this suggestion with the palms directed towards his back and confirm the fact that he has relegated all that is besides God to the background.

The Mālikites and the Rawāfiḍ (or shī'ahs) present certain *āḥādīth* in support of the movement of the hands. Shaykh Akbar has held on the other hand, that these *aḥādīth* relate to a gentle movement of the hand. Movement of the hands with jerks (irsāl al-yadayn) is not *sunnah* in prayers. The case is otherwise. It is the detaining of the hands (*imsāk*) that is sunnah. There is only one follower of the Mālikite school who has quoted authority for *irsāl*, and this Tradition has been incorporated in the Mālikite tracts on fiqah. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn 'Abd al-Birr has explained that no additional *ḥadīth* has been able to establish its authenticity.

Although the etiquette governing the presentation of a petition demands that only the person chosen as the representative should read the petition, with the others remaining quiet, nevertheless the Audience is for all who are present, and they are all individually required to salute the Ruler. ثنا *thanā'* تسبیحات *tasbīḥāt* تکبیرات *takbīrāt* رکوع *rukū'* سجده *sajdah* تحیات *taḥīyāt* etc., are obligatory for all worshippers—be he the Imām or his followers. When therefore all have collected to offer their supplication, they would first salute the Ruler through *thanā'* which is "سبحانک اللهم" "Praise be to God". The Royal salutation being over, the congregation would now be ready to submit its request. As said earlier, it is in the nature of the Regal Audience Chamber that, while the request is being presented, only the representative of the supplicants, e.g., the Imām, should speak out; the others should remain silent. The *sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*, which is the essence of the prayer and is an explanation of the object of the supplication, should be recited by the Imām only. The rest should stand behind and hear him recite.

Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah: Titles of Honour, Courtesy, and substance of supplication

This *sūrah* is also known by the name of "تعلیم المسئلہ" "educating about the problem". Remarkably wondrous is the scheme in the presentation of the supplication indeed! When a request is presented, the Ruler is addressed reverentially through appellations of honour and praise. These titles, appellations, and modes of praise vary from one ruler to the other. He who presents his supplication has to conform to these modes and cannot be guided by his own preferences and imagination.

In fact, there are definite appellations and words by which one is supposed to address his elder brother, teacher and father. One cannot go by improvisation or imagination. To do so would be nothing short of mere travesty. There is the incident of a person who had thought that honorific titles like *Qiblah*, *Ka'bah*, etc., were in vogue because they emphasise the respect to be paid to one's father. He then thought there could be other titles to emphasise the display of honour towards his father, so he began his letter with: "salutations and peace be upon you, my revered father who is *Qiblah* and *Ka'bah*, *Makkah* and *Madīnah*, *Bayt al-Maqdis*. *Karbalā-i-Mu'allā*, *Najaf Ashraf*, and the *Jāmi' Masjid* of Delhī". Although his guess was not wrong; nevertheless, the use of the titles adds up to a joke because he departed from traditional usage. Now the Absolute Ruler of the Cosmos also has to be addressed according to certain specific appellations. How would we know what are the words suitable to His Omnipotence and Omniscience? He has Himself told us what the Appellations should be.

A Brief survey of the Contents of the *Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*

Hence in the beginning of *Sūrah al-Fātiḥah* only three appellations, the ultimate in meaningfulness and delicacy of implications, have been used.

These are: "الحمد لله رب العالمين" "Praise be to Allāh, Lord of the Worlds", "الرحمان الرحيم" "The Beneficent, the Merciful" and "مالک یوم الدین" "Owner of the Day of Judgement".

These appellations are then succeeded by a description of the objective in successive steps. After the appellations have been set forth, alongwith the sentences invoking honorific titles and praises, is a brief sentence which is suggestive of man's request to his Creator. Thus in "ایا ک نعبد و ایا ک نستعین" "Thee (alone) we worshlp; Thee (alone) we ask for help". first part of the passage means that man is the slave of God; and the second purports to state that man is requesting God for the grant of his wishes. The actual supplication commences after this preliminary presentation of the objective. "اهدنا الصراط المستقيم" "Show us the straight path" is a supplication which covers the welfare in the present and the future. This is elaborated by "صراط الذين انعمت عليهم" "The path of those whom Thou hast favoured". The Qur'ān has stated this in greater detail at another place thus :

Whoso obeyeth Allāh and the messenger, they are with those unto whom Allāh hath shown favour, of the Prophets and the saints and the martyrs and the righteous.
(Qur'ān, 4:69)

مَنْ يُّطِعِ اللّٰهَ وَالرَّسُوْلَ فَاُولٰٓئِکَ مَعَ
الَّذِيْنَ اَنْعَمَ اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِمْ مِّنَ النَّبِيّٖنَ وَالصِّدِّيْقِيْنَ
وَالشُّهَدَآءِ وَالصّٰلِحِيْنَ (النساء، آيت ٦٩)

Then comes the classification lest the path followed be that which has earned His Anger. Thus "غير المغضوب عليهم ولا الضالين" "Not (the path) of those who earn Thine anger nor of those that go astray". The application is presented by a representative as demanded by etiquette, but it bears the signatures of all the applicants and each applicant requests for the grant of his wish. This is "آمين" "So be it" which is said by all the members of the congregation when the Imām has completed the *sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*. The implication is: "Accept it, O Lord, for this is what we desire."

Sanction by God on the sentences of the *sūrah Al-Fātiḥah*

Each sentence of the request bears the stamp of Approval and Sanction from God. This has been elaborated in a *ḥadīth* narrated by Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah. According to that Companion of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), the *ḥadīth* runs as follows: (God says): "I have divided prayer, which is the link between Myself and My humble servant, into two portions. Half the portion is Mine and half My servant's. And My servant shall obtain whatsoever he desires." Abū Hurayrah said: "The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) remarked: Hearken! 'when the servant says, 'Praise be to Allāh, Lord of the Worlds', God says, 'My servant has praised Me; he shall have what he wants.' The servant says: 'The Beneficent, the Merciful;' and God says, 'My servant has praised Me, he shall have his desire granted'. The servant says: 'Owner of the Day of Judgement,' to which God replies: 'Verily, my servant has acknowledged My Greatness, and it is for Me alone. This *āyah* is half Mine and half My servant's'. He says: 'Thee (alone) we ask for help.' (God says): That is, 'this *āyah* is divided between Myself and My servant half and half. My servant shall have his desire fulfilled. The last part of the *sūrah* is for My servant' who says: 'Show us the straight path, the path of those whom Thou hast favoured, not (the path of those who earn Thine Anger, nor of those who go astray.' "

Thus all the sentences carrying honorific titles and praise acquire, in turn, God's approval. In the *ḥadīth* due to *Ummi Salmah* it has been shown that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) used to pause on the completion of each sentence. Shaykh Muḥī al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī says; "We do not proceed with each sentence (carrying some request) unless we hear the reply thereto with our own ears." But, then, this is an attribute of the great. Ordinary persons like us should pause at every sentence and imagine that God has heard us and has given His Answer. Shaykh Ibn al-'Arabī, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Qayyam and Shāh Walī Allāh have especially commended this mode.

The Qur'an as an Answer to Prayer

The request (in *al-Fātiḥah*) was that we want to be shown the straight path. The Grant of the prayer is acquiesced to, by God who says: "This Qur'ān is a guidance to those who abstain from evil". In other words, follow this and you will find yourself along the straight path. The Qur'ān describes the path that is straight—and one from which one should not deviate. Thus we have:

Lo! this Qur'ān guideth unto that which is straightest... (Qur'ān, 17:9)	اِنَّ هٰذَا الْقُرْاٰنَ يَهْدِىْ لِلَّتِىْ هِىَ اَقْوَمُ (بنی اسرائیل آیت ۹)

The Qur'ān thus guides us along the Straight Path. The Imām after reciting *sūrah al-Fātiḥah*, recites an *āyah* from any *sūrah* of the Qur'ān. The Imām is the representative of the followers in the recitation of the prayer and by the same token he has been authorised by God in reciting His Reply. The proper procedure, of course, would have been for the Imām to recite in every *rak'at* the whole of the Qur'ān after the *sūrah Al-Fātihah* since the whole of it is in reply to "اهدنا الصراط المستقيم" "Show us the straight path". But since the water of the whole river can quench the thirst, nevertheless, one jar full of river-water can also serve that purpose. In the same way, the Qur'ān is a Book of guidance and each *āyah* in it also provides instruction and guidance at every step. It would, therefore, be sufficient to recite a few *āyāhs*. Our humility becomes all the more apparent after our prayer has been accepted and when we realise our abject state as just opposed to God's sublime and Exalted honour. The head and the face, which are held to be the most respectable parts of the body, are made to touch the ground, and the nose rubbed. This symbolizes man's utmost humility and God's supreme greatness. This process of prostration is *sajdah.* Now there are two kinds of Attributes of God: Favour and expression of terror. Two successive *sajdāhs* during each *rak'ah* are probably meant to emphasise these Twin Attributes. Once the request has been presented and accepted, and the recitations of servitude to God have been completed, it is like the courtiers who present to the Ruler their gratitude and consecrations that the devotees offer their humility and submission to the Almighty.

Prayer for safety and asking blessing the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

The implication of this part is that all the verbal prayers, corporeal submissions, sacrifices and alms-giving, reckoned as prayers are all for You (God). This is the meaning of "التحیات لله والصلوات والطیبات". After that we recall that holy and exalted person through whom we have sought access to God, who has taught us how to present ourselves in the court of God. Hence we offer blessings to him and simultaneously pray for the devotees and ourselves for safety. This is "السلام علیک ایها النبی" upto "وعلیٰ عباد الله الصالحین". As such, only a dunce who thinks that since the name of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) features in the prayer, he (the Holy Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم) is also a co-sharer with God, in prayers. In order to remove this absurdity and circumscribing the object of prayer only to God, devotion was duly first mentioned to Him and, then simultaneously, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) being His special devotee, his Prophethood was mentioned. This is "اشهد ان لا اله الا الله واشهد ان محمداً عبده ورسوله" "I testify that there is no god but Allāh and that Moḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is His servant and Messenger". When the name of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has come up, we recall his obligations done to us and offer blessings to him. All functions of the prayers having been completed, the devotees, before returning, however, supplicate to God. This is "دعاء ماثوره" "a prayer handed down as tradition from ancestors". When we consider the nature of prayer, its every aspect and characteristic show that the worshipper, according to his ability concentrates towards God and dissociates himself from the world. Consequently, addresses like, "سبحانک" "You are sacred" "ایاک نعبد وایاک نستعین" "Thee (alone) we worship, Thee (alone) we ask for help", "اهدنا" "show us" and "قوله علیه السلام الصلوة معراج المؤمن" "It is the saying of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that prayer is the zenith of the dignity of *mu'min*", all these testify to the nature of prayer. Returning from prayer is just like coming from the court of God. That is why salutations have been made to follow prayer. Just as salām has been prescribed when we bid adieu on leaving a mundane get-to-gether similarly salām has been prescribed for us on leaving the Court of the Almighty God. What greater dissociation can there be than this? And this is "السلام علیکم و رحمة الله" "Salutation and His Mercy be upon Ye, ". Such, then, is the nature of prayer when each movement and by every action obedience, submission, and subjugation to God, have to be expressed.

The significance of *Zakāt*

Now that we have acknowledged in the court of God that we are His servants, subservient to His command, governed by it, and are the inhabitants of His Kingdom, it is but logical to assume that in token of this acknowledgement, we must pay the tax of His Government. At times it so happens that it matters little if one's life is demanded for a cause, but the demand of wealth is a difficult task. When the worldly states exact taxes, He being the Owner of everything, tax to His Government (*zakāt*) is also due.

> When Allāh's are the treasures of the heavens and the earth. (Qur'ān, 63:7)
>
> وَلِلّٰهِ خَزَآئِنُ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضِ (المنافقون آيت ٧)

Zakāt is therefore in the nature of an obligation and its objective has been pointed as follows:

> (It) should be taken from the rich and distributed among the poor.
>
> تُؤْخَذُ مِنْ اَغْنِيَآئِهِمْ وَتُرَدُّ اِلٰى فُقَرَآئِهِمْ

God being very Compassionate and Kind has exempted the poor and the indigent from the tax, and only the rich have to pay according to the schedule.

The Wonderful Wisdom Governing the Scale of Taxation

The ingenious way in which *zakāt* is payable according to the mode of income speaks of the equitable way in which defrayal of the *zakāt* has been apportioned. Thus on things that are obtained without any labour, e.g., taxes on minerals, are higher than on others, i.e. Khums or the one-fifth. Then come sources on which some effort is exerted but which does not amount to excessive labour:

> That which comes from the ground through showers of rain etc.
>
> مَآ اَخْرَجَتْهُ الْاَرْضُ بِمَآءِ السَّمَآءِ وَنَحْوِهٖ

It is not essential in such farming here to resort to irrigation (as in cases where water is provided by ample rainfall). The tax here is reduced by one-half, that is *ushr*. This is followed by the land where irrigation is necessary. Here the level of taxation is reduced by another half, that is, it becomes half *ushr*. This is again succeeded in the descending order by sources of income where one has to work day and night, as against agricultural farming, which requires intermittent labour. Once the ploughing and the seeding have been done, some attendance is necessary off and on till such time as the crop is harvested. The slab of taxation in transactions requiring constant surveillance and labour is therefore half of half *'ushr* that is, the fortieth part.

The Relationship between *Zakāt* and Prayers

It should be self-evident from the foregoing that *zakāt* and *ṣalāt* are prayers that belong to the same category and both represent the concept of the ruler-ruled relationship. The Qur'ān, while mentioning *ṣalāt*, often mentions *zakāt*, whether the description be of a direct nature or by way of admonition that material wealth should be spent in the cause of God or descriptions of an allied nature, the substance of which is *zakāt*. It should be evident that of the two, *ṣalāt* is the superior, and *zakāt* is derived from it. This is behind the reason that the obligation of *zakāt* has been postulated only after the obligation of *ṣalāt*. It would also be appreciated that *zakāt* is the completing process of *ṣalāt* and consequently God says:

> But, if they repent and establish worship and pay the poor due, then leave their way free. (Qur'ān, 9:5)
>
> فَاِنْ تَابُوْا وَاَقَامُوا الصَّلٰوةَ وَاٰتَوُا الزَّكٰوةَ
> فَخَلُّوْا سَبِيْلَهُمْ ۔ (التوبہ، آيت ٥)

Thus, if the *Mushrikīn* expiate and renounce their idolatrous ways, embrace Islam, establish *ṣalāt*, the performance of which is to acknowledge the suzerainty of God, and pay poor due *zakāt*, they should be left free and not reprimanded. Here the relationship between God and man has been linked to *ṣalāt* and *zakāt* both, particularly as the latter is the completion of the process starting with *ṣalāt*. This is reflected in the statement of Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq when his injunction about *zakāt* was opposed by certain tribes of Arabia, and Ḥaḍrat 'Umar was opposed to war with them in this behalf. The statement amply demonstrates the relationship between prayers and *zakāt*.

By God, I shall fight all those that regard *zakāt* and prayers as separate entities, although the Book of God has counted them as parts of our submission to God.

وَاللّٰهِ لَأُقَاتِلَنَّ مَنْ فَرَّقَ بَيْنَ الصَّلٰوةِ
وَالزَّكٰوةِ وَإِنَّهُمَا لَقَرِيْنَتَانِ فِيْ كِتَابِ اللّٰهِ

In the Qur'ān the mention of prayers and *zakāt* are self-evident. By "قرينتان فی کتاب الله" Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr has probably emphasized the fact that in the Book of God the individual's submission to God is dependent upon both prayers and *zakāt*. And, because *zakāt* is the end-point of *ṣalāt*, so, just as fighting (*Qitāl*) is ordained against those that cause hindrance in the performance of *ṣalāt*, so it is likewise against those who refuse to pay *zakāt* "هذا والله اعلم بالصواب وعلمه اتم واكمل" "God alone knows the truth and His knowledge is complete and perfect."

Fasting and *Ḥajj*

Both "صوم" "fasting" and *Ḥajj* are the manifestations of the love we bear towards God. The real obligation of the two, however, is that of *Ḥajj*, while "صوم" is its preface and introduction. Affection, when it reaches a degree of intensity, is called "عشق" "love". In the Qur'ān, God has judiciously avoided the use of the word, "عشق" "love" and has used the word, "حب", as in: "والذين آمنوا اشد حبا لله" "Those who believe are the stauncher in their love for Allāh" (Qur'ān, 2:165).

However, when love attains intensity, certain changes take place (in the attitude) of the person involved in love. The first change is that the lover feels disgusted and indifferent to everything except his beloved. He gives up interest in eating, drinking and charm in his family and neglects even his parents and other relatives.

When he further progresses in love, he starts disliking his hearth and home. He is engrossed in the thought of his beloved. When love further increases and when it happens that his beloved resides in another city, he longs to be in that city and loses his attachment to his own city and home.

When the lover has reached a more advanced stage of love, he would be unconscious of every thing around him and even of himself. He would be distracted, his hair would be rough; he would not care whether or not his clothes are decent and whether he wears a cap or puts on the shoes. He would cry wildly and leave for the abode of his beloved. First of all, he would wander outside the abode of his beloved so that he may at least have a single glance of her and kiss everything having the slightest association with her ;

أَمُرُّ عَلَى الدِّيَارِ دِيَارِ لَيْلَى   أُقَبِّلُ ذَا الْجِدَارَ وَذَا الْجِدَارَا

وَمَا حُبُّ الدِّيَارِ شَغَفْنَ قَلْبِيْ   وَلٰكِنْ حُبُّ مَنْ سَكَنَ الدِّيَارَا

**The lover near the house where Laylā lives, is standing before the wall!
Is it not a manifestation of the love that seeps out from the lover's heart that he finds tranquillity only in the house of the beloved?**

The last stage of love is reached when the lover is prepared to lay down his life for the sake of the beloved. These observations with respect to mortal beloved are common and we see them in our every day experience: they are so self-evident that there is no exaggeration.

Fasting and *Ḥajj* as Manifestation of the Love of God

We have described how the intensity of love is manifested, and, if this happens on human level, then on the spiritual level also these different stages would obtain. The first step is, then, that of ṣawm (fasting) which signals abstinence from food and drink; the man and woman have no concern with each other. The significance of "صوم" is abstinence from these three desires. And once abstinence from these corporeal desires has been effected, what else among the worldly things remains? The desire to give satisfaction to one's appetite for food and the sexual urge is dominant in man and the rest—such as farming, service, trading, labour—are either the means for obtaining these or are their results. Along with fasting, therefore, "اعتکاف" "retirement with a view to offering prayers" has been held to be commendable. This would signify that the sentiment of love has progressed all the more. The house and the household affairs are relinquished, and the *mu'min* passes his days and nights in search of the Real Love, the Ultimate Beloved.

Then another stage comes. This world of ours has a city—a most special and consecrated city, and within the precincts of that city is a House—a House that is a special Manifestation of the Ultimate Beloved. It is but for this association that that city and that House are dedicated to the Beloved. This House is called "بلد الله الحرام" and "بيت الله". This House has been brought into existence by God for providing solace to His lovers and in the words of Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) He has commanded His servants to go there :

And proclaim unto mankind the Pilgrimage. They will come unto thee on foot and on every lean camel; they will come from every deep ravine.
(Qur'ān, 22:27)

وَأَذِّنْ فِي النَّاسِ بِالْحَجِّ يَأْتُوكَ رِجَالًا
وَعَلَىٰ كُلِّ ضَامِرٍ يَأْتِينَ مِن كُلِّ فَجٍّ عَمِيقٍ۔
حج آیت ۲۷

After *Ka'bah* was completed, Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام) stood on a hillock and proclaimed: "O people! God has made it obligatory for you that you should perform pilgrimage." God, in His endless Bounty, had this call carried to every soul (just as we hear announcements today from distant places). The soul of those who had the good fortune of performing pilgrimage responded with the words "لبیک". It is the same spark of love which makes thousands of persons to traverse on foot and others through various means of conveyance to reach the ultimate destination, (the House of God), daring all impediments and ordeals. This is the result of the prayer which was offered by Prophet Ibrāhīm (عليه السلام). "فاجعل افئدة من الناس تهوى اليهم" "So incline some hearts of men that they may yearn towards them" (Qur'ān, 14:37). The proclamatoin was again resounded through the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

And pilgrimage to the House is a duty unto Allāh for mankind, for him who can find a way thither. (Qur'ān, 3:97)

وَلِلَّهِ عَلَى النَّاسِ حِجُّ الْبَيْتِ مَنِ اسْتَطَاعَ
إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا (آلِ عمران آیت ۹۷)

Iḥrām

Once the lover has discovered where his beloved resides, he immediately makes his way in that direction in utter confusion and madly overwhelmed by the desire to meet his beloved. He is neither conscious of his attires nor of his appearance. Bidding adieu to all the requirements of decency in dress and appearance, he would wrap sheets round himself in the manner of shroud, and would keep on running with the words, "لبیک لبیک" "Here I am for you! Here I am at your command!" on his tongue. In this way the servant presents himself before his Master. This is "*iḥrām*".

Ṭawaf, *Ḥajar Aswad*, **and** *Multazam*

No sooner has the lover reached the precincts of the abode of the beloved, than he starts circumambulating the lanes and by-lanes, surrounding the abode. He would embrace everything having the slightest of association with the beloved, and kiss it with a passionate longing. These represent "طواف البیت وتقبیل الحجر والتزام الملتزم" "Circumambulation of *Ka'bah*, embracing and (kissing) the Black Stone, and touching *Multazam*."

The lover would climb the hillock or some elevated place so as to catch a glimpse of the beloved. This is symbolised by "سعی بین الصفاوالمروة" This is why it has been prescribed that the Mounts of *Ṣafā* and *Marwah* should be climbed. For this reason it has been ordained to keep one's face towards *Qiblah* while mounting these hillocks during *Sa'ī*. This is followed by atonement and lamentation in the plain of "عرفات" *'Arfāt* and the throwing of stones on the abode of satan, for it was here that he tried to way-lay the ancestor of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), Prophet Ismā'īl. The lover having completed all the preliminaries now prepares to lay his head at the feet of his beloved, for sacrifice. On this analogy every faithful should have sacrificed himself in the cause of God, but this would be against the wisdom of creation. And so sacrifice (of ruminants) has been substituted.

Then We ransomed him with a tremendous victim. (Qur'ān, 37:107)

وَفَدَيْنَاهُ بِذِبْحٍ عَظِيمٍ۔ الصّٰفّٰت آیت ۱۰۷

That is, lamb that was heavenly and of a high quality, fully grown and lovely to watch. Then this sacrificial rite was established for all times in memory of Prophet Ismā'īl, and an animal is being sacrificed. We have to bear this point in mind at the time of sacrifice. Once a lover has passed through the different phases of his ordeal in love, the beloved would pay special attention to him. He would be called in the presence of the beloved, and "طواف زیارت" is analogous to this sight. And those who have spiritual knowledge can well appreciate that this "طواف زیارت" is the procurement of the sight of the Beloved. The name given to all these rites and rituals is *Ḥajj*.

Objection to the "محبوبیت" "loveliness" of God Answered

It should have become all too obvious that from the beginning to the end, *Ḥajj* represents the love of man for God and God's Response thereto. What more fortunate can there be a man that he should prove and establish himself as the lover of his Creator? This point is being emphasised, since many so called enlightened and well educated people express their inability to understand why Islam has prescribed these rites for *Ḥajj* (manāsik *al-Ḥajj*) and why quite a sane person has to present himself as a mad man. Alas! little they understand that a man may stoop to anything for the sake of his worldly beloved, who, from the beginning to the end, is:

In reality, from the beginning to the end, is one whose birth originates from impurity and his end is a filthy corpse and, between these two stages, he is bearing filth and rubbish.

اَوَّلُهٗ نُطْفَةٌ قَذِرَةٌ وَّاٰخِرُهٗ جِيْفَةٌ قَذِرَةٌ
وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَا يَحْمِلُ الْعَذِرَةَ

Yet they do not understand that such incidents of love can be obligatory in relation to the love for the Almighty God who is precisely the basis of all the causes, sources and attributes of all beauties and perfection. How can such people understand this, who has no idea of the love for the spiritual sweetheart, the Almighty God? They are slaves to their own desires and passions. The question is whether such love for God is really acquired by all, the answer would be that, if we fail to create such love in ourselves, the fault is ours. The *sharī'at* is not responsible for it. The *Sharī'at* does require us really to love God. If, unfortunately, we fail to create such love for God, we should, at least, assume the appearance of the lovers of God and should appear in their garb. It has been seen that even mere appearance makes us remove our hurdles; God is Compassionate and Beneficent beyond all imagination, so much that: "رحمت حق بہانه می جوید بہانمی جوید" "God's Mercy looks for an excuse, not for the price".

The secret of the magicians who professed faith in the Prophethood of Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) has been explained is that, whereas, although, Pharaoh was the real target for Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام), he did not profess faith in his Prophethood to the last; the magicians who had come to oppose Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) were favoured with guidance. Tradition has it that the magicians had attired themselves in similar costumes as that of Prophet Mūsā (عليه السلام) were. Thus *Ḥajj* is a prayer that is replete with wisdom and is a major prayer. In *Sharḥ Taḥrīr al-Uṣūl* a statement from Imām Abū Ḥanīfah to the effect that *Ḥajj* is the most excellent of prayers (*afḍal al-'ibādāt*) has been reported.

It should have become clear that just as in the Qur'ān *ṣalāt* and *zakāt* have been described in association with *zakāt* following *ṣalāt* similarly the descriptions of "صوم" and *Ḥajj* are also associated but "صوم" precedes *Ḥajj*. However both of the prayers, among others, *ṣalāt* and *Ḥajj* are foremost and equipoised with respect to each other. It was with respect to these two kinds of worship that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had appointed Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq as his deputy and substitute. Makkah was conquered in 8 A.H. and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) performed the pilgrimage in 10 A.H. In 9 A.H. he appointed Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq as his deputy and leader of the Muslims who were sent on pilgrimage. It was during this pilgrimage that the responsibility for proclamation regarding the commencement of the *sūrah Barā't* only was assigned to Ḥaḍrat 'Alī. Similarly, on his death-bed (*maraḍ al-mawt*) the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said "مروا ابا بكر فليصل بالناس" "Ask Abū Bakr to lead the prayers for the people". Although the Holy Prophet's wives, Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah and Ḥaḍrat Ḥafṣah, repeatedly expressed their objections about it, but the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) overruled their objections vigorously and repeated "مروا ابا بكر فليصل بالناس" This shows that the First Caliph was not only the most exalted of the Holy Prophet's Companions but the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) made him his deputy and substitute in both these prayers, and thus expressed his desire to appoint him as the Caliph of the Muslims.

The Hanafite reply to Imām Bukhārī's argument is that they, too regard observance as a part of Islam; the objection lies in its being an integer of faith or *īmān*. Imām Bukhārī believes Islam and *īmān* as comprising a unitary nature: this is not acceptable to the Hanafites.

CHAPTER III
ON MATTERS RELATING TO FAITH

According to the words of Allāh, the Glorious and Exalted, "It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces to the East and the West; but righteous is he who believeth in Allāh...till the end of the verse (i.e. *al-Muttaqūn*). (Qur'ān, 2:177)

And "Successful indeed are the Believers".... (Qur'ān, 23:1)

8. 'Abdullāh bin Muḥammad al-Ju'fī conveyed to us that Abū 'Āmir al-'Aqadī narrated that they wereinformed by Sulaymān bin Bilāl who quoted 'Abd Allāh bin Dīnār from Abū Ṣāliḥ who reported.

✱ Abū Hurayrah as saying: the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: Faith comprises more than sixty branches, one of them being modesty (i. e. bashfulness, self-respect, scruple etc.).

بَابُ أُمُورِ الْإِيمَانِ

وَقَوْلِ اللّٰهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ لَيْسَ الْبِرَّ أَنْ تُوَلُّوا وُجُوهَكُمْ قِبَلَ الْمَشْرِقِ وَالْمَغْرِبِ وَلٰكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللّٰهِ إِلٰى قَوْلِهِ الْمُتَّقُونَ قَدْ أَفْلَحَ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْآيَةَ

8 - حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ الْجُعْفِيُّ قَالَ ثَنَا أَبُو عَامِرٍ الْعَقَدِيُّ قَالَ ثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ بْنُ بِلَالٍ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ دِينَارٍ عَنْ أَبِي صَالِحٍ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ الْإِيمَانُ بِضْعٌ وَسِتُّونَ شُعْبَةً وَالْحَيَاءُ شُعْبَةٌ مِنَ الْإِيمَانِ

Imām Bukhārī first related the spirit (or significance) of Faith, and then mentioned its pillars and articles, and is now describing its branches. Bukhārī has not used here the phrase "اجزاء الایمان" "parts of Faith"—though he means the same thing—but he used the phrase "امور الایمان" "matters relating to Faith" which may either mean parts of Faith or associates and complements of Faith. Bukhārī has chosen two verses of the Qur'ān in this Chapter. Each verse gives details regarding matters of Faith, and perhaps no such details arefo nnd elsewhere in the Qur'ān.

"It is not لَيْسَ الْبِرَّ أَنْ تُوَلُّوا وُجُوهَكُمْ قِبَلَ الْمَشْرِقِ وَالْمَغْرِبِ وَلٰكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللّٰهِ righteousness that ye turn your faces to the East and the West; but righteous is he who believeth in Allāh...

This verse is an answer to the silly question which the Jews, polytheists and hypocrites raised when by order of Allāh, *Qiblah* was changed from *Bayt al-Maqdis* (Jerusalem) to *Ka'bah* in prayers (*ṣalāt*). This question has been mentioned in the first verse of the second *Pārah* "سیقول".

The foolish of the people will say: What hath turned them from the *Qiblah* which they formerly observed?
(Qur'ān, 2:142)

سَيَقُولُ السُّفَهَاءُ مِنَ النَّاسِ مَا وَلَّاهُمْ
عَنْ قِبْلَتِهِمُ الَّتِي كَانُوا عَلَيْهَا ط (بقرہ، آیت ۱۴۲)

This question has been answered in the same verse as follows:

Say (O Prophet): Unto Allāh belong the East and the West. (Qur'ān, 2:142)

قُلْ لِلّٰهِ الْمَشْرِقُ وَالْمَغْرِبُ - بقرہ آیت ۱۴۲

This definite reply means that when a person devotes himself whole-heartedly to the service and obedience of his master and carries out his orders whenever they are issued, it would be complete nonsense on the part of a third person (or a critic) to ask as to why the devotee was doing one thing earlier and now doing a different thing altogether. Whosoever believes that Allāh is Omnipotent and Omniscient shall never raise this sort of criticism. A servant's sole duty is to comply with orders (and not to ask questions).

In order to understand this verse one has to bear in mind لیس البر a certain rule which helps in the solution of various problems. The rule is that '*Ibādat* (religious rituals) is (i) formal and (ii) real, just as man has body as well as soul. Body is the formal (or temporal) side of man, but soul is the real thing. When soul leaves body (i.e. when a man dies) his body is nothing but merely a heap of dust. After death one is called man only metaphorically (in reference to the past). Similarly, the external shapes of *'Ibādat* viz. prayers, obligatory charity, fast, *Hajj* etc. are formal things, but their spirit is *Īmān* (Faith). Just as body without soul is quite worthless and after death one ceases to be man, so also every *'Ibādat* and good act without *Īmān* (Faith) is quite useless. It is not really an *'Ībādat* or a good deed. It is for this reason that although hypocrites verbally expressed *Kalima-i-Shahādat* and performed all kinds of *'Ībadāt* viz. *ṣalāt, zakāt* (obligatory charity), Fast, Ḥajj etc, The Qur'ān condemns them as follows :

"Lo! the hypocrites (will be) in the lowest deep of the fire"
(Qur'ān, 4:145)

إِنَّ الْمُنٰفِقِيْنَ فِي الدَّرْكِ الْأَسْفَلِ مِنَ
النَّارِ، (النساء، آیت ۱۴۵)

Because all acts of hypocrites are acts only in form but not in spirit as they have no *Īmān* (Faith), therefore their deeds will not be taken into account here and will not bear fruit in the Hereafter. Similarly, the good deeds of infidels will not be rewarded on the Last Day. The Holy Qur'ān has explained this point by a good and interesting example, as under :

As for those who disbelieve, their deeds are as a mirage in a desert. The thirsty one supposeth it to be water till he cometh unto it and findeth it naught, and findeth, in the place thereof, Allāh Who payeth him his due ; (Qur'ān 24:39)

وَالَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْٓا أَعْمَالُهُمْ كَسَرَابٍ بِقِيْعَةٍ
يَّحْسَبُهُ الظَّمْاٰنُ مَآءً حَتّٰٓى إِذَا جَآءَهُ لَمْ يَجِدْهُ
شَيْئًا وَّوَجَدَ اللّٰهَ عِنْدَهُ فَوَفّٰىهُ حِسَابَهُ (نور، آیت ۳۹)

As mirage looks like water but is not water, so also the deeds of unbelievers appear to be good in form only not in fact or spirit, because they have no Faith. Again as a thirsty person is deceived by a mirage, infidels are also deceived by the so-called good acts. In short, any *'Ībādat* or virtue in the absence of Faith is good only in name but never in the real sense of the word.

In the above quoted verse *Baytal-Maqdis* (Jerusalem) and Ka'bah have not been mentioned, though they form the subject matter here, and it was a proper place for them. The Qur'ān, however, has mentioned East and West here, because none considers it a virtue to turn to the East or the West simply because East is East and West is West.

...but righteous is he who believeth in Allāh and the Last Day and the angels and the Scripture and the Prophets; and giveth his wealth, for love of Him-to kinsfolk and to orphans and the needy and the way-farer and to those who ask, and to set slaves free; and observeth proper worship and payeth the-poor-due. And those who keep their treaty when they make one, and the patient in tribulation and adversity and time of stress. Such are they who are sincere. Such are the God-fearing."
(Qur'ān, 2:177)

وَلٰكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنْ اٰمَنَ بِاللّٰهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْاٰخِرِ
وَالْمَلٰٓئِكَةِ وَالْكِتٰبِ وَالنَّبِيّٖنَ ۚ وَاٰتَى الْمَالَ عَلٰى
حُبِّهٖ ذَوِي الْقُرْبٰى وَالْيَتٰمٰى وَالْمَسٰكِيْنَ وَابْنَ
السَّبِيْلِ وَالسَّآئِلِيْنَ وَفِي الرِّقَابِ ۚ وَأَقَامَ
الصَّلٰوةَ وَاٰتَى الزَّكٰوةَ ۚ وَالْمُوْفُوْنَ بِعَهْدِهِمْ
إِذَا عٰهَدُوْا ۚ وَالصّٰبِرِيْنَ فِي الْبَأْسَآءِ وَالضَّرَّآءِ
وَحِيْنَ الْبَأْسِ ۗ أُولٰٓئِكَ الَّذِيْنَ صَدَقُوْا ۗ وَأُولٰٓئِكَ
هُمُ الْمُتَّقُوْنَ ۝

Relation between Chapter and the *Āyah*

Imam Bukhārī wishes to prove his claim by means of two *āyāhs*. In one, have been enumerated the articles or deeds of faith and in the other, the attributes of *mu'min*. About the first *āyah* Ḥafiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has quoted a Tradition from the author, 'Abd al-Razzāq, who, in turn, has reproduced it from a narration by Mujāhid due to Ḥaḍrat Abu Dhar. Ḥaḍrat Abū Dhar questioned the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) concerning faith. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in reply, recited the *āyah* which we have quoted. Imām Buhārī did mention this *āyah*, but did not reproduce the narration of Abū Dhar. This is because Bukhārī only reproduces narrations which fulfil his conditions.

The people of the Book, upon the descent of the command concerning change in the direction of the "قبلہ", began to advance objections. One group said : "Is it any thing short of a joke that the "قبلہ" direction has been changed?" The other group objected : "If he (i.e., the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) were a real prophet, he would have prayed in the direction of the "بیت المقدس" which is the "قبلہ" of Prophets." In short, a babel of voices was raised. By these objections and shouting their contention was that the stability in observance of the direction of "قبلہ" was the only criterion for redemption. The foregoing *āyah* of the Qur'ān has repudiated this concept, and has unequivocally shown that God is not bound to observe the limitations of the East or the West. The *āyah* is very comprehensive in so far as the articles of faith and the different (religious) regulations and principles are concerned. These principles and commandments are of three kinds and are capable of becoming the standard of perfection of mankind. The first kind is that which concerns with the reformation of belief. These have been mentioned in the following *āyah* :

(...but righteous is he) who believeth in Allāh and the Last Day and the angels and the Scripture and the Prophets.
(Qur'ān 2:177)

مَنْ اٰمَنَ بِاللّٰهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْاٰخِرِ وَالْمَلٰٓئِكَةِ
وَالْكِتٰبِ وَالنَّبِيّٖنَ ۚ (بقرہ آیت ۱۷۷)

The second kind also features in the same *āyah* and concerns with the improvement of the social condition of the people.

...and giveth his wealth, for love of Him, to kinsfolk and to orphans and the needy and the way-farer and to those who ask, and to set slaves free. (Qur'an 2:177)

وَاٰتَى الْمَالَ عَلٰى حُبِّهٖ ذَوِى الْقُرْبٰى وَ
الْيَتٰمٰى وَالْمَسٰكِيْنَ وَابْنَ السَّبِيْلِ ۙ وَالسَّآئِلِيْنَ
وَفِى الرِّقَابِ ۚ (بقرہ آیت ۱۷۷)

The third kind concerns ethical conduct. This is further divided into two parts : fulfilling the obligations (imposed by religion) and nobility of character. The former is depicted in the following *āyah* :

And observeth proper worship and payeth the poor-due. (Quran 2:177)

وَاَقَامَ الصَّلٰوةَ وَاٰتَى الزَّكٰوةَ ۔ بقرہ آیت ۱۷۷

In disciplining oneself things that constitute nobility of character are mentioned hereunder :

And those who keep their treaty when they make one, and the patient in tribulation and adversity and time of stress.
(Qur'an 2:177)

وَالْمُوْفُوْنَ بِعَهْدِهِمْ اِذَا عٰهَدُوْا ۚ وَالصّٰبِرِيْنَ
فِى الْبَاْسَآءِ وَالضَّرَّآءِ وَحِيْنَ الْبَاْسِ ۗ (بقرہ، آیت ۱۷۷)

These three kinds of piety having been described at the conclusion of the same *āyah* it has been stated :

Such are they who are sincere. Such are the God-fearing. (Qur'an 2:177)

اُولٰٓئِكَ الَّذِيْنَ صَدَقُوْا ۗ وَاُولٰٓئِكَ
هُمُ الْمُتَّقُوْنَ (بقرہ، آیت ۱۷۷)

That is, only those who fulfil the above obligations are the true believers worthy of redemption. Direction of the prayers cannot serve as the criterion for perfection.

Imām Bukhārī has argued from the *āyah* that the word "بر" (goodness) occurring at the commencement of the *āyah* includes both the beliefs and the acts or deeds. Thus, he concludes that acts constitute an integer of faith and, in accordance with his view, acts, and *Īmān* are one. This is supported by the *ḥadīth* due to Ḥaḍrat Abū Dhar. But for the Ḥanafites the essence of faith and goodness are not one, and the foregoing *āyah* supports the Ḥanafite view, since the word "بر", denoting acts or observance or deeds, occurs as a conjunction and there is a difference here in that conjunction by the copulative particle is distinguished by the word to which another is joined by another copulative particle. This conjunction or adjunction therefore shows that faith and acts are discrete (separate).

Let us now move to the second *āyah* which Imām Bukhārī **has** reproduced in support of his view.

"Successful indeed are the believers, Who are humble in their prayers. And who shun vain conversation. And who are payers of the poor-due; And who guard their modesty-Save from their wives or the (slaves) that their right hands possess, for these they are not blameworthy. But whoso craveth beyond that, such are transgressors And who are shepherds of their pledge and their covenant. And who pay heed to their prayers. These are the heirs, who will inherit Paradise. There they will abide. (Qur'an 23-1-11)

قَدْ اَفْلَحَ الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ ۝ الَّذِيْنَ هُمْ فِيْ
صَلَاتِهِمْ خَاشِعُوْنَ ۝ وَالَّذِيْنَ هُمْ عَنِ اللَّغْوِ
مُعْرِضُوْنَ ۝ وَالَّذِيْنَ هُمْ لِلزَّكٰوةِ فَاعِلُوْنَ ۝
وَالَّذِيْنَ هُمْ لِفُرُوْجِهِمْ حٰفِظُوْنَ ۝ اِلَّا عَلٰى اَزْوَاجِهِمْ
اَوْ مَا مَلَكَتْ اَيْمَانُهُمْ فَاِنَّهُمْ غَيْرُ مَلُوْمِيْنَ ۝ فَمَنِ
ابْتَغٰى وَرَآءَ ذٰلِكَ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْعٰدُوْنَ ۝ وَ
الَّذِيْنَ هُمْ لِاَمٰنٰتِهِمْ وَعَهْدِهِمْ رَاعُوْنَ ۝ وَ
الَّذِيْنَ هُمْ عَلٰى صَلَوٰتِهِمْ يُحَافِظُوْنَ ۝ اُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ
الْوَارِثُوْنَ ۝ الَّذِيْنَ يَرِثُوْنَ الْفِرْدَوْسَ هُمْ فِيْهَا
خٰلِدُوْنَ ۝ (المؤمنون آيت ١١-١)

The attributes of the *mu'mins* described here admit of two possibilities. These possibilities are "كاشفه[1]" and "مادحه" 'explanatory of the position of the *mu'min* himself or the additional attributes of *mu'min*'. By way of the former, they would support Imām Bukhārī, while, if they are of the latter nature, they would support the Hanafite views.

That is, the *ḥadīth* was حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ ابْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ الْجُعْفِيُّ قَالَ ثَنَا اَبُوْ عَامِرٍ الْعَقَدِيُّ narrated by 'Abd Allāh bin Muḥammad Ju'fī who had it from Abū 'Āmir al-'Aqadī who had it, in turn, from Sulaymān bin Bilāl. Among the narrators of this *ḥadīth*, there are others besides Abū 'Āmir 'Aqadī, similarly, from Abū 'Āmir 'Aqadī upto 'Abd Allāh Ju'fī there are other narrators.

---

[1] Imām Bukhārī considers acts as the parts of the essence of faith. In support of his argument he has quoted the *āyah*, "قد افلح المومنون" that this detailed *āyah* indicates the different acts of *mu'mins* as their attributes. If these attributes are explaining the real being of a *mu'min*, the argument of Bukhārī is correct. But, if on the contrary, these attributes, are simply the additional qualities complementary to the real being of a *mu'min*, Bukhārī's argument is wrong. But this *āyah* would support the stand of the Hanafites who do not consider acts as parts of the essence of faith but regard them the perfecting elements of faith.

Difference in the Words Employed in the Narration

This narration, however, carries different words. Some narrations have [1]"بضع و ستون" as in the version of the Bukhārī, while in the others, such as that of Muslim, the words are "بضع وسبعون[2]"; still some more have "بضع و ستون او بضع و سبعون" with some ambiguity, as in the approach of Muslim. Tirmidhī in a narration has used the words, "ار بع و سبعون" (four and seventy), but the version is considered to be weak.

Allamah Ibn Hajar's Lapse in this Regard

Ḥafiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has written on this occasion that there is some difference between the members of the transmissional chain deriving from Sulaymān bin Bilāl. Some have transmitted "بضع و ستون" (parts and sixty) and some "بضع و سبعون" (parts and seventy). It is indeed amazing that a scholar so outstanding as Ḥafiẓ Ibn Ḥajar should have been mistaken and have not taken stock of the real situation. The fact is that Abū 'Āmir 'Aqadī had two pupils : 'Abd Allāh bin Sa'īd and 'Abd bin Ḥamīd. From these two, Muslim has adopted the narration of Abū 'Āmir 'Aqadī through this transmissional chain. In this reproduction the words are "بضع و سبعون"; this shows that there is difference among the transmitters of Abū 'Āmir 'Aqadī as well.

Difference between preference and application

Nevertheless, the words of the narrations are different. Two groups of scholars have come into existence in order to resolve this difference. One party has attributed the difference to the procedure, particular to narration; that is, the word employed in the *ḥadīth* is one, and that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) must have said either "ستون" (sixty) or "سبعون" (seventy). Later on, narrators have, however, changed the version; and some stuck to one and the others to the other. Should this be the case, we shall not have to resort to reconciliation but to the selection of one of the words. Reconciliation is taken recourse to, if the contents of two *ḥadīths* are in opposition to each other, whereas, here, we have one *ḥadīth* only. Only the words of the narrators are different. Some have accorded preference to "ستون", since it is more certain, as "سبعون" includes "ستون". Others have preferred "سبعون" because "سبعون" is greater than "ستون" and this greatness bespeaks of its greater trustworthiness.

Against the theory about "excess" Kirmānī has expressed his doubts and says that the view that if a word stands for greater number it does not mean that it is more authentic. This state does not, however, obtain in this *ḥadīth*, but it is not proper to attribute it to difference in narration since there is no apparent reason for it.

The other alternative is that this difference should be taken to be an actual difference; that is to say the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) at different times used the two words. If this is so, it is necessary to reconcile the two versions. Scholars have said a lesser number does not nullify a greater one, and it is possible that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was given the greater number later on through revelation. Thus there would be no room for contradiction.

Be that as it may, the *ḥadīth* means that *īmān* is like a tree and has its stages, and the articles of faith are its offshoots. Bukhārī, in consonance with his own approach, has invoked the analogy of the tree which is *īmān*, with its offshoots related to it as the branches are related to the tree and, according to the well-known concept of the Ḥanafites, these things are related to *Īmān* (faith) in the same way as the branches are related to the roots of the tree. However, the net conclusion of both is identical, and my own final investigations have led me to conclude that the Ḥanafites also believe act to be a part of *īman*.

---

[1] That is, sixty. [2] (Sab'ūn) is seventy.

اَلْإِيمَانُ بِضْعٌ وَسَبْعُونَ شُعْبَةً۔

That is, *īmān* has more than seventy departments. Some versions have "ان الايمان". But the word presented by Bukhārī here is more apparent in so far as his own approach goes, since "الايمان" can also mean that *īmān* comprises so many ancillaries. Many statements have been ascribed to "بضع". It is generally held that the offshoots could extend from three to nine. It is difficult to pinpoint the number implied here but it could be said that the number would be sixty or seventy or slightly more.

Researches by Scholars on sections of Faith

Scholars have conducted searching investigations into the different sections of faith, and several tracts have been written on the subject.[1] Ḥafiẓ Ibn Ḥajar considers the treatise by Abū Ḥatim bin Ḥibbān to be the best. In the foreward of the book Ibn Ḥibbān has said that, having read this *ḥadīth*, he was seized by the keenness in pursuing the significance of this number and in determining it. When he added all the acts that have been called *īmān* in the ḥadīth, he found the number to be less. He then addressed himself to the Qur'ān. Having totalled all the observances that have been designated as *īmān*, he still found the number to be less. Then he totalled the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* adding up all that has been equated with *īmān*, and, having subtracted the reiterations, he found that the number was in conformity with that given in the *ḥadīth*. Ibn Ḥibbān's assiduity and the ingenuity he displayed in investigation is indeed laudable. He has divided this collection of *īmān* into (i) "اعمال قلب" the acts of the mind or the heart, (ii) "اعمال لسان" acts of the tongue, and (iii) "اعمال بدن" corporeal acts.

The best thesis on the Different Aspects of Faith

In my opinion all the aspects of faith should be derived from the Qur'ān. I pursued with considerable diligence the different aspects of the Qur'ān pertaining to *īmān* and expanded the range of search. Ibn Ḥibbān took stock only of the aspects which were directly spoken of, as *īmān*, whereas I included within my survey aspects which are parts of *īmān*, although they are not directly alluded to, as parts thereof. These aspects are the essentials of *īmān*, and their objective is faith itself. I added up all these aspects, reaching the figure of sixty-seven. But, on further consideration, I noted that certain aspects that have been mentioned are such that they are divided into two parts, and these two parts can be made into one too. They can, however, be counted as two different permanent aspects as well.

We might quote the example of "انفاق فی سبیل الله" (disbursing in the path of God). It features very often in the Qur'ān, and is an aspect of faith. *Zakāt* is also a part of "انفاق فی سبیل الله", but it is so important per se that it is regarded as a very important part of the *Shariāh*. Now it is possible that considering the context *zakāt* may be considered as a part of "انفاق فى سبيل الله" or that *zakāt*, in view of its own importance, could be counted as a permanent aspect. The *sharī'ah* sometimes, in order to emphasise the importance of a particular commandment does so. This is an example out of the many of the commandments of the *sharī'ah*.

---

[1] The book that is most beneficial in this regard is Shaykh Abū 'Abd Allāh Halīmī's Al-Minhāj. The book by Imām Ḥafiẓ Abū Ḥatim Ibn Ḥabān Busti is the waṣf al-Imān wa shu'bah. Shaykh 'Abd al-Jalīl has written a book bearing the same title, on the same subject. Afterwards, the famous Muḥaddith, Shaykh Muḥammad Murtaḍā Zubaydī Ḥanafī wrote a summary of Ibn Ḥabān's and 'Abd al-Jalīl's works entitled '*Iqd al-Jamān*. Bayhaqi's Shu'abal Imān is also a very well known work.

An example of the "منهيات" (things that are interdicted or forbidden) is "اجتناب من الزور" (abstain from lies). A part of this interdiction is the avoidance of false testimony, which has been counted in the *Ḥadīth* as one of the major sins. This point has been emphasised by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) repeatedly in the *Aḥādīth*. Now false testimony could either be regarded under the main heading of absolute falsehood or "اجتناب عن الكذب" as abstinence from lie, with its most important constituent, "اجتناب عن شهادة الزور" under a different and independent heading. Once these aspects of *īmān* were considered, it was found that six aspects were such as could be considered to be of a permanent nature, and which could be considered as entries under another context. If the latter is the case, the total number would be sixtyseven, whereas, if they are counted as permanent and allowed to stand on their own, that number would increase to seventy-three. These details have been entered into a notebook which I wrote for this purpose.

This investigation also solves the problem of the conflicting numbers of sixty and seventy. If there is some contradiction between these two numbers in the *Ḥadīth* itself, this might be one of the reasons. From this discussion we also obtain another reconciliation. If these aspects are considered as not being discrete and as single entities, the number would be "بضع و ستون" that is, sixty-seven. If counted as different entities, these additional aspects would amount to seventythree.

That is modesty is a part of faith. وَالْحَيَاۤءُ شُعْبَةٌ مِّنَ الْاِيْمَانِ

The Literary Meaning of "حيا"

'Modesty' has been explained lexicographically in the following words:

It is the manifestation of change in the temper and distress which grips a person from the fear of doing something that would stigmatise him or lead to his being reprimanded or reproached.

هُوَ تَغَيُّرٌ وَّانْكِسَارٌ يَّعْتَرِى الْاِنْسَانَ مِنْ خَوْفِ مَايُعَابُ بِهٖ وَيُلَامُ عَلَيْهِ

Others have defined "حيا" as below:

Modesty is a seizure by fear in one's conscience from the doing of a deed that is unbecoming.

هُوَ انْقِبَاضُ النَّفْسِ خَشْيَةَ ارْتِكَابِ مَايَكْرَهُ -

Imām Rāghib has defined "حيا" as follows:

The revulsion felt by one's temperament in the performance of a foul deed is modesty.

هُوَ انْقِبَاضُ النَّفْسِ عَنِ الْقَبِيْحِ

All the three definitions, however, amount to the same thing what is "مايلام عليه ويعاب به" "doing something that would stigmatise him or lead to his being reprimanded or reproached or reproved" is also "مايكره" "that is unbecoming". What is "مايكره" is "قبيح" "foul" and is "ارتكاب قبيح مايلام عليه ويعاب به" "the doing of a foul deed that would stigmatise him or lead to his being reprimanded or reproached or reproved." This, then is the real meaning of "حيا". But sometimes "ترک الشئى بسبب" that is, to renounce a thing for same reasons, is also "حيا" in the metaphoric sense. God has Himself said:

Lo! Allāh disdaineth not to coin the similitude even of a gnat. (Qur'ān, 2:26)

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَسْتَحْيٖٓ اَنْ يَّضْرِبَ مَثَلًا بَعُوْضَةً

Abstinence is a pre-condition for modesty and therefore what is conditional is applied to what is conditioned.

The Meaning of "حیا" in the *Sharī'ah*

This is how "حیا" has been defined by the *sharī'ah*:

(Modesty) is a kind of disposition that prompts one at abstaining from the deeds that are foul and prevents the righteous from detraction in righteousness. In another *ḥadīth* similarly it has been stated that (Modesty) is righteousness to the fullest extent.

هُوَ خُلُقٌ يَبْعَثُ عَلَى اجْتِنَابِ الْقَبِيْحِ وَ
يَمْنَعُ مِنَ التَّقْصِيْرِ فِيْ حَقِّ ذِي الْحَقِّ وَلِهٰذَا
جَآءَ فِيْ حَدِيْثٍ اٰخَرَ الْحَيَآءُ خَيْرٌ كُلُّهٗ (ہٰذا من فتح الملہم)

The question has been raised as to why modesty should be attached so much importance in discussion. Some expositors have explained that the reason for attaching great importance to it is because it is the noblest and eminent aspect (of *Sharī'ah*). It overshadows all other aspects and influences so much so that one who possesses perfect modesty would abstain from and avoid all that is prohibited. Also modesty invites towards the performance of the commandments. A person observing modesty with regard to God and believing that he is before Him and He is observing his acts would never do any thing against the commands of God nor transgress His Laws. A pupil, howsoever mischievous he may be, when, in the presence of his teacher, and, thinking that his teacher is observing his movements, would be compelled, by virtue of human nature, to be careful in the presence of the teacher.

The Benevolent Acts of God and His obligations on mankind are so numerous that they are beyond all estimates; modesty is an attribute which is a source of insight and belief in the Divinity of God. Moreover, such an insight and faith are conducive to further encouragement. Thanksgiving to our Creator can only arise from modesty and therefore some mystics have taken modesty to mean:

Your Master should not see you at a place where he has forbidden you to go.

اِنَّ مَوْلَاكَ لَا يَرَاكَ حَيْثُ نَهَاكَ

The implication is that we should not do a thing that is prohibited: for, if we do it, He shall see us. Thus all the aspects of *īmān* are either acts of obedience (to God) or abstinence from sins. Modesty dominates all these. In one *ḥadīth* of Tirmidhī occurs:

The Apostle of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "Observe modesty from God in a measure that is His due." The Companions said: "O Prophet of God, this is how we observe modesty." Thereupon the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) replied: "You do not observe modesty of such a kind. The proper modesty is that which would make you desist from prostration before anyone except God, and to guard all that is within its ambit—beliefs, thoughts, intentions etc. one's stomach and all that is within, remembring death and ordeals. He who is mindful of the Last Day should renounce the worldly life. He who observes these principles is like one who has observed modesty from God as he ought to have observed.

قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اِسْتَحْيُوْا
مِنَ اللّٰهِ حَقَّ الْحَيَآءِ قَالُوْآ اِنَّا لَنَسْتَحْيِيْ مِنَ اللّٰهِ
حَقَّ الْحَيَآءِ يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ! قَالَ لَيْسَ ذٰلِكَ وَ
لٰكِنَّ الْاِسْتِحْيَآءَ مِنَ اللّٰهِ حَقَّ الْحَيَآءِ اَنْ يَّحْفَظَ الرَّأْسَ
وَمَا حَوٰى وَالْبَطْنَ وَمَا وَعٰى وَيَذْكُرَ الْمَوْتَ وَ
الْبِلٰى وَمَنْ اَرَادَ الْاٰخِرَةَ تَرَكَ زِيْنَةَ الدُّنْيَا وَاٰثَرَ
الْاٰخِرَةَ عَلَى الْاُوْلٰى فَمَنْ يَّعْمَلْ ذٰلِكَ فَقَدِ اسْتَحْيٰ
مِنَ اللّٰهِ حَقَّ الْحَيَآءِ۔

Modesty and the status of *Iḥsān* (benevolence)

The above exposition establishes modesty to be the benevolence which has been described in the *ḥadīth* of the Angel Jibrā'īl. "آن تعبد اللہ کانک تراہ فان لم تکن تراہ فانہ یراک" Pray to God as if thou art seeing Him, and, if thou cannot see Him, believe that He seest thee.

When once this attribute has been achieved, man cannot commit sin and, when man progresses in the attainment of this attribute, he gradually attains a peculiar faculty of perception.

Modesty observed by Hadrat 'Uthman

The person who within the *ummah* was predominant in the attribute of modesty was Ḥadrat 'Uthmān. This is verified by the *ḥadīth* in which it has been said: "اصد قهم حياء عثمان" 'Uthmān is the most punctilious observer of true modesty.

The implication of the *ḥadīth* is that some of the Companions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) manifested peculiar attributes, e.g., devotion by Ḥadrat Abū Dhar Ghaffārī and trustworthiness by Ḥadrat Abū 'Ubaydah bin Jarrāḥ. In much the same way, modesty was an attribute which predominated in the disposition of Ḥadrat 'Uthmān, and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) kept this in view as narrated in the *Ḥadīth*. It was because of this perfection he had achieved in the observance of this attribute that his perceptive faculty had become very acute, so acute indeed that once a person came to an assembly, and the Third Caliph, casting a look at his eyes, remarked: "What has happened to the people that they dare come to our assembly performing adultery with their eyse on the way all the time." The man was seized by shame, and he requested the Third Caliph to atone for his sin. On further enquiries by people he did confess he had looked on the way at a woman who was a stranger to him. This attribute of Ḥadrat 'Uthmān was the result of his utmost abstinence from all that is profane. Gradually his instinct had become so sharp, acute, and pronounced, and its impact on his vision had become so intense that he could feel everything which could not be felt. This perception and insight was the result of his extraordinary modesty.

In sum, modesty predominates in all the aspects of faith, whether they concern the acts of subservience or abstinence from sinfulness. Its importance and high regard have been especially emphasised. The genesis of "شعبة" division of faith is for offering respect, and modesty is a most important aspect of faith.

Some exegetes have expressed the doubt whether it is an aspect of faith or not. This is because modesty is not an acquired characteristic or attribute. It is a rare and innate quality like intelligence or dullness. Rare qualities are not acquired, whereas *īmān* is acquired, being subject to Reward and Punishment: it is acquired through further experience. This might lead one to believe that modesty is not an integer of *īmān*. In order to remove this doubt it has been explained that modesty, too, is one of the aspects of *īmān*.

The point whether modesty is among the rare and innate characteristics has been answered by Imām Ghazālī and others. According to this view, modesty comprises two kinds: (i) the natural aptitude that is endowed to someone as an integral part of his disposition and instinct (this is a rare attribute) and; (ii) the imitative aspect, that is, using one's innate capacity according to the dictates of *sharī'ah* and observing its precepts. It is quite obvious that the second is dependent upon endeavour and the more one perfects its practice, the more it will grow. Thus modesty that is innate and rare is not an aspect of *īmān*, and it could also be present in a man who is perfectly modest. Modesty implied here is that which is acquired. But there is little doubt that the natural aptitude leads to the acquired talents and the growth of the latter depends on the progress of the former. That someone is gifted with an outstanding attribute in his disposition is the result of the Benevolence and Beneficence of God.

Islam Modifies the practice of Good Attributes

Sometimes a non-believer possesses good attributes. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), for example, praised Al-Shaykh 'Abd al-Qays and told him that he possessed two qualities that Allāh likes: 'الحلم والاناة' that is, clemency and humility. The latter asked the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) "کانافی آم حدثا", whether he possessed them before his conversion to Islam or whether they sprang up themselves later. The Holy Prophet's reply was: "بل قدیم" "that is, these attributes were not new and were with him earlier". Shaykh 'Abd al-Qays thereupon said.

All praise be for God, the Almighty, who vouchsafed to me two attributes which He Himself likes.

اَلْحَمْدُ لِلّٰهِ الَّذِىْ جَعَلَنِىْ عَلٰى خُلُقَيْنِ يُحِبُّهُمَا

A non-believer could also be blessed with noble characteristics. As for the question, how these noble characteristics are particalarly related to Islam and the *sharī'ah*, Ibn Khaldūn has said that these characteristics are improved through the medium of Islam. Imām Ghazālī says the *sharī'ah* changes the practical use of these noble attributes; it does not change the innate and instinctive characteristics, however. Mishkāt has the *ḥadīth*:

Believe as true when you are told that a mountain has vanished from were it stood. (But) do not testify when you are told that a man's habits have changed.

اِذَا سَمِعْتُمْ بِجَبَلٍ زَالَ عَنْ مَّكَانِهٖ فَصَدِّقُوْهُ وَاِذَا سَمِعْتُمْ بِرَجُلٍ زَالَ عَنْ خُلُقِهٖ فَلَا تُصَدِّقُوْهُ ۔

It is, however, possible that the original characteristics might persist but the their practical use might change. Islam and the *sharī'ah* would then determine the use of these characteristics. For example; Caliph 'Umar was by temperament a man in whom severity and oppression predominated. After his conversion to Islam, this attribute did not change; only its attitude underwent a transformation. Before his conversion, he directed the heat of his hardness towards the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), and he was even prepared to cut (may God forbid!) the sacred head of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). Before his conversion it was known "آشد هم فی الامر الکفر" "he is the most vehement in the ways of *kufr*". When, however, he directed this vehemence towards the Infidels, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) himself by way of praise said about him: "آشد هم فی آمر اللہ" "Of all the men, he is the most vehement in the ways of God". We thus find that the basic trait did not change: only its direction, undergoing a shift, became noble instead of base. However, a good thing here is that the original *ḥadīth* carries not only a mention of modesty (which might lead us to its particularisation) but also of other attributes. The narrative quoted by Bukhārī is brief. Muslim has reproduced the whole of the *ḥadīth*.

The Apostle of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said, "*Imān* has slightly more than seventy or slightly more than sixty departments. The most exalted of them is to say, 'There is no God except Allāh', and the least is that which comprises removing a troublesome obstruction from the way. And modesty is also a department of *īmān*.

قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اَلْاِيْمَانُ بِضْعٌ وَّسَبْعُوْنَ اَوْ بِضْعٌ وَّسِتُّوْنَ شُعْبَةً فَاَفْضَلُهَا قَوْلُ لَآ اِلٰهَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ وَاَدْنَاهَا اِمَاطَةُ الْاَذٰى عَنِ الطَّرِيْقِ وَالْحَيَآءُ شُعْبَةٌ مِّنَ الْاِيْمَانِ ۔

This narrative has not confined itself to the mention of modesty. It has many departments, and only three have been described as an example. It has also been said that not all departments are equal and are distinguished by degrees of greatness or smallness. Some are of a higher nature on which all the actions depend, and are like the root; some less higher like the branches and the foliage; and some are intermediate. Each one of them has been exemplified. Therefore, the question as to why modesty should have been chosen does not arise, since these three orders have been shown by giving three examples. The point that could be raised here is only this much; there would be many departments of intermediate nature, and why therefore has modesty been specially chosen? Two reasons should make it clear why this particularisation has been resorted to.

Sum Total of the Discussion

This *ḥadīth* does not confine itself to the mention of modesty only. Three attributes have been described as an example which in fact is an indication towards various aspects. Thus this *ḥadīth* is an abbreviation and abridgement of the *ḥadīth* of the Angel Jibra'īl which is the summary of the religion of Islam, and constitutes the mother of *sunnah* "ام السنة". Its explanation would be that the statement, "لا اله الا الله" "There is no god except Allāh" points out to *īmān*. By "اماطة الاذى عن الطريق" "removal of obstruction from the way" is meant Islam, whereas modesty signifies the doing of good. The Holy Prophet's exposition of modesty has already been described earlier with reference to the *ḥadīth* quoted in the Ṣaḥīḥ Tirmidhī. Some mystics have offered the following definition of modesty "ان مولاک لایراک حیث نهاک" "Your Master should not see you where He has forbidden you to go". But this stage of modesty can be achieved only after extreme meditation (devotion) and self-discipline. This is the (lofty) position of perception and is, equally that of virtue. The mystics in their terminology call it perception or observation. Considered thus, this *ḥadīth* is the quintessence of religion and alludes to the different departments of faith.

The Different Kinds of foul aspects of modesty

Whatever the way in which we explain modesty "مایعاب به ویلام علیه یا مایکره یا قبیح" there are three basic kinds of foul or unbecoming actions "قبیح عقلی قبیح عرفی قبیح شرعی" "Defective thinking, coventionally foul deeds, and those deeds that are regarded as foul by *sharī'ah.*"

Modesty intellectualy defective

It is held to be bad by every sensible person, whether orthodox or unorthodox, and whether he belongs to any place. But it is common sense which is dependable. Conventional aspects and those concerning *sharī'ah* are too obvious to be elaborated and from this view, modesty can be also divided into three kinds; (i) intellectual, (ii) conventional and (iii) and that conforming to *Sharī'ah*. Intellectual modesty may be defined as follows: "هو انقباض النفس عن القبیح العقلی" Intellectual modesty makes one's conscience abstain from that thing which is intellectually bad and this can be the basis of the definition of the conventional modesty and the religious modesty. However, all these three kinds do have one common factor "انقباض النفس" "abstension by conscience"—and the difference lies in their respective characteristics. The real significance of modesty is the same but, in view of its other attachments, it would be divided into three kinds. One, that is devoid of intellectual modesty is designated as "*majnūn*" mad. Those that are deprived of conventional and religious modesty are respectively known as "*ablah*" silly and "*fāsiq*" transgresser.

Comparison of the Different kinds of modesty and the Reasons for Preference

Sometimes the different kinds of modesty are contrasted with one another. But the religious modesty and intellectual modesty do not clash with each other. It is not possible that a healthy intellect would call a thing good and the *sharī'ah*, bad or vice versa. The only condition is that the intellect should be healthy (and unstinted). I have discussed this point in great detail in my treatise, "*Al-'Aql wa Al-Naql*", and I would suggest that for details with regard to this question the reader should refer to this work. Conventional and religious kinds of modesty can, of course, be compared. Convention changes with the times; we see that in the case of the veil, and so on. In view of such comparison, that object would be taken into consideration which causes modesty and the status *sharī'ah* accords to such **a** type of modesty. It is possible that the *sharī'ah* would make the performance of a thing obligatory, whereas the convention would prevent its performance, as has been seen, in many cases today. In such circumstance, religious modesty would be obligatory and the conventional modesty would not be permitted. If the *sharī'ah* has made it *wājib* (binding), it must be observed perferentially and, if it has been declared as an act having been done by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or as any desirable act, the attitude of perference would be *sunnat* or taken as desirable. If any lawful act is obstructed that is if any act having been done by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) the supreme follower of *Sharī'ah* has not attained the status of obligation, *wujub*, or even *sunnah* and has been done by him only because it was lawful and if the conventional modesty objects to it, that is the contention of the age becomes such that its performance causes modesty, in such a case, he is at liberty to act upon conventional modesty.

Criticising lawful act of the Holy Prophet on the plea of convention should be avoided

If a lawful act *mubāh* done by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is contrary to the convention of any time, it is not permissible for one to doubt (God forbid) that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had acted against the tenets of modesty. If anything, is in opposition to the act of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) it must be regarded as the narrow mentality of the age and the folly of the people. We should regard the acts of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) as virtuous and laudable. The glory of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is such :

I havn been sent for the completion of morality.

بُعِثْتُ لِأُتَمِّمَ مَكَارِمَ الْأَخْلَاقِ

Hence no act or quiescence on the part of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (God forbid!) can lead one to the slightest of doubts about its being contrary to the tenets of modesty. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) says :

Fortunate ones are self-respecting, and I am more self-respecting than they are and God is more Self-Respe cting than I am.

إِنَّ السُّعَدَآءَ لَغَيُوْرٌ وَإِنِّي أَغْيَرُ مِنْهُمْ وَ
اللّٰهُ أَغْيَرُ مِنِّي ، الحديث

The incident narrated in a *ḥadīth* would serve as an example. A Companion invited the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) pointing towards Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah said:

"And she (that is, 'Āyishah would also accompany me". He said, "No". The Holy Prophet, (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) thereupon, declined his invitation. The person at last, agreed that the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) should bring her along with him. Only then did the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) and Ḥaūrat 'Āyishah go towards his house.

وَهٰذِهٖ فَقَالَ الرَّجُلُ لَا فَاَبٰى اَنْ يُّجِيْبَهٗ
اِلَّا اَنْ اَنْعَمَ لَهٗ فِيْهَا اَنْ تَاْتِيَ مَعَهٗ فَاَقْبَلَا يَتَدَافَعَانِ
اِلٰى مَنْزِلِ ذٰلِكَ الرَّجُلِ ـ

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) knew fully well the sincere affection of his Companions. It was a measure of prudence that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) manifested this informality and asked about Hadrat 'Āy'ishah. It was nothing but a reflection of the Holy Prophet's generosity and benevolence that he had been so informal. Even an ordinary man today will not be in a position to manifest such an informal etiquette.

At sometimes it so happens that the conventional and religious modesty are not in conflict with each other. But it happens that formally such incident causes modesty to which *sharī'ah* had neither the positive nor the negative attitude. On occasions like these, conventional modesty could be relied upon, and in certain cases it should be followed, e.g., eating, while walking on the road, walking bareheaded on barefoot should be avoided. These have not been censured in the *sharī'ah* but conventionally they are regarded as acts that are unbecoming and immodest. Here it is conventional modesty that should surve as the guide. Jurists regard a man acting contrary to politeness as one whose testimony is vitiated. And politeness *murawwat* is associated with conventions.

CHAPTER IV

A Muslim is he who does not offend other Muslims by his words (tongue) and deeds (hands).

9. Ādam bin Abī Iyās informed us that Shu'bah reported to us from 'Abdullāh bin Abī Safar and Ismā'īl bin Abī Khālid from 'Āmir Sha'bī who quoted.

✶ 'Abdullāh bin 'Amr bin 'Ās as saying: the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) declared that: "A Muslim is he who does not harm (other) Muslims with his tongue, while a Muhājir (one emigrant) is that who forsakes what Allāh has forbidden".

Abū 'Abdullāh Imām Bukhārī stated and Abū Mu'āwiyah also reported that Dā'ūd bin Abī Hind told us that Amīr Sha'bī narrated that I heard 'Abdullāh bin 'Amr (also) reporting this tradition from the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). It has also been reported by 'Abd Allāh on the authority of Dā'ūd who has quoted 'Amr from 'Abdullāh for transmitting it from the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).

بَابٌ اَلْمُسْلِمُ مَنْ سَلِمَ الْمُسْلِمُوْنَ مِنْ لِسَانِهٖ وَيَدِهٖ

٩ ـ حَدَّثَنَا اٰدَمُ بْنُ اَبِيْ اِيَاسٍ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا شُعْبَةُ عَنْ عَبْدِاللّٰهِ بْنِ اَبِي السَّفَرِ وَاِسْمَاعِيْلَ عَنِ الشَّعْبِيِّ عَنْ عَبْدِاللّٰهِ بْنِ عَمْرٍو عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ اَلْمُسْلِمُ مَنْ سَلِمَ الْمُسْلِمُوْنَ مِنْ لِسَانِهٖ وَيَدِهٖ وَالْمُهَاجِرُ مَنْ هَجَرَ مَا نَهَى اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ اَبُوْ مُعَاوِيَةَ ثَنَا دَاوٗدُ بْنُ اَبِيْ هِنْدٍ عَنْ عَامِرٍ قَالَ اَبُوْ عَبْدِاللّٰهِ وَقَالَ اَبُوْ مُعَاوِيَةَ ثَنَا دَاوٗدُ بْنُ اَبِيْ هِنْدٍ عَنْ عَامِرٍ قَالَ سَمِعْتُ عَبْدَ اللّٰهِ بْنَ عَمْرٍو يُحَدِّثُ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَقَالَ عَبْدُ الْاَعْلٰى عَنْ دَاوٗدَ عَنْ عَامِرٍ عَنْ عَبْدِاللّٰهِ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

A Muslim is he who does not offend other اَلْمُسْلِمُ مَنْ سَلِمَ الْمُسْلِمُوْنَ مِنْ لِسَانِهٖ وَيَدِهٖ Muslims by his words (tongue) and deeds (hands). When this attitude is adopted, it is advisable to make him feel ashamed by reconciling him on his undesirable conduct, contrary to the spirit and meaning derived from his name and title. If he fears nothing, he should, at least keep up the regard attached to his name.

For example, if a person bears the name of Ḥabīb Allāh (the lover of God), and he commits some evil deed, some one might tell him: "Your name is Ḥabīb Allāh, why do you do the work of 'Adū Allāh (the enemy of God)?" This *ḥadīth* also bears the same purport—"If you call yourself a Muslim, keep people safe from tribulations." If a Muhājir or an Emigrant, having emigrated, does something that goes against the original purpose of emigration, he is asked: "Have some consideration for your title of Muhājir and refrain from doing something that is contrary to your title." The sum of both these passages is that the real Muslim is he from whose tongue and hands (affliction caused by his words and deeds) people are safe. A real Muhājir is he who has renounced all that militates against the Will and Wish of Allāh. This of course, does not mean that by abusing someone a man loses his Islam or if an Emigrant has done something undesirable, he is no longer a Muhājir. Here the circumscription is meant which is embodied in the proverb: الناس العرب، المال الابل اوالرجل زيد. It is the Arabs who are men and the merchandise is the camels or it is Zayd, a man in real sense.

Thus, that which has been defective is considered to be non-existent. It is an admitted principle in rhetoric that, if the importance of any thing is meant to be increased, an object of greater significance is applied to that thing, with the result that the thing, in view, has the exclusiveness in the particular characteristic. According to this principle of rhetoric, the sentence of the *Ḥadīth* "المسلم من سلم المسلمون من لسانه ويده" would mean, that a Muslim is one whose tongue and hands are not moved for doing harm to Muslims, as if the word, Muslim, is meant to stand for the entire mankind.

Due Regard for the Interpretation of the Wisdom of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

The implication of the *Ḥadīth* is that the perfect Muslim is one from whose tongue and hands the other Muslims are safe. It means that being a Muslim, is to be a perfect Muslim. This would be said if the *Ḥadīth* is investigated academically. But this interpretation should not be accepted, for the reason that the importance of the interpretation of the *Ḥadīth* would be under valued. The objective of the *Ḥadīth* is "تحذيرالناس" "cautioning human beings" and this is adversely affected. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) gave it the apparent or external caption with this in view. If this wisdom were not underlying the adoption of this external and ordinary caption (meaning), the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) could, as well, have said, "المسلم الكامل من سلم" "A perfect Muslim is one, peace...etc." But the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has not come out with such an explicit interpretation on such occasion. We should, therefore, exercise due care not to resort to such a caption or interpretation before the common people.

Muslim jurists have also discussed this problem from this point in view. If, for example, the people wish to find out about backbiting 'غيبت' and whether backbiting during fasting violates fast, they should be told the *Ḥadīth*, wherein, has been said "الغيبة يفطرالصوم" "backbiting is the breaker of fast" and that the fast does not remain intact. No more than this should be said. If a man, however, has done a certain act and enquires about its implications, he might be told the real significance with the possible interpretation. A statement has been attributed to Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās according to which, if one who had not committed a murder but intended to do so and he wished to ascertain whether there was atonement, he (Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās) would, according to the apparent meaning of the Āyah, say, No, there is no atonement for murder.

(Whoso slayeth a believer of set purpose,) his reward is Hell for ever.
(Qur'ān 4:93)

فَجَزَآؤُهٗ جَهَنَّمُ خَالِدًا فِيهَا (النساء آيت ٩٣)

If he, on the other hand, saw that a person had already committed murder, was repentant, and had come to him for expiating for the sin, he did explain to him the nature of the problem. In short, the scholars should be allowed some latitude in such matters as warranted by the circumstances.

The question that could arise in connection with this *ḥadīth* is that there is no mention in it regarding harassment of the Infidels. What is the command regarding harassment against them? Concerning harassment against the Infidels it may be said that infidels are divided into two kinds : (i) "ذمی" and (ii) "حربی". The former are those for whose safety, concerning life and property, Muslims are responsible. We cannot cavil at their religion which is allowed complete toleration. Such infidels, according to the commands of Islam, are to be counted as Muslims. Their lives, property and religion should be safe from the oppressions of the Muslims. Consequently, in contrast of "مسلمون", we, in the *ḥadīth*, have "حربی" (fighting infidel). The fighting Infidel regards the blood and property of Muslims as his lawful right. Thus the infidels that are arrayed in battle against the Muslims are not covered by this *ḥadīth* nor is war, involving their life and property, has been avoided in the *ḥadīth*[1]. A Muhājir is one who renounces all that is forbidden by Allāh. There are two kinds of emigration: the apparent and the inner. Apparent emigration is change of one's country or city, and it does not have any intrinsic merit in itself. It only provides an opportunity to observe and profess the Commands of God. Real Emigration (hijrah) is the renouncing of actions prohibited by God, the Almighty.[2]

CHAPTER V

What kind of Islam is the best?

10. We have been told by Sa'īd bin Yaḥyā bin Sa'īdinil Umawī Qurayshī who said that he was informed by his father who said: Abū Burdah bin 'Abdullāh bin Abī Burdah told us via Abū Burdah that he (the latter) heard :

✱Abī Mūsā say. They said: O Prophet of Allāh! What kind of Islam is the best? He said: The person from whose tongue and hands Muslims are safe.

بَابٌ أَيُّ الْإِسْلَامِ أَفْضَلُ
10- حَدَّثَنَا سَعِيدُ بْنُ يَحْيَى بْنِ سَعِيدِ
الْأُمَوِيُّ الْقُرَشِيُّ قَالَ ثَنَا أَبِي قَالَ ثَنَا أَبُو بُرْدَةَ
بْنُ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ أَبِي بُرْدَةَ عَنْ أَبِي مُوسَى قَالَ
قَالُوا يَا رَسُولَ اللهِ أَيُّ الْإِسْلَامِ أَفْضَلُ قَالَ
مَنْ سَلِمَ الْمُسْلِمُونَ مِنْ لِسَانِهِ وَيَدِهِ ۞

---

[1] In this narration, regarding Wa qāla Abū Mu'āwiyah and Wa qāla 'Abd al-A'lā, some discussions have taken place. See page 325 *Faḍl-al Bārī*.

[2] The object of the passage is to admonish the Emigrants lest they should be led to believe that, after Emigration, there is no need to abstain from what is prohibited and that there is no need for doing good deeds. Emigration is effected as it is not possible to observe the Commandments of God without resorting to it. If even now, after emigration the prohibitions are not renounced, it is nothing but a matter of extreme shame.

This chapter is in the elaboration of the qualities and characteristics of Islam demanding priority. Thus, Islam which is united with *īmān* according to Bukhārī has been proved subjected to waxing and waning.

In one of the narrations reproduced in the Muslim Sharīf the word, "خیر" (good) occurs in place of "افضل" (superior). The words of the versions are "ای المسلمین خیر فقال من سلم المسلمون من لسانه ویده" ("which kind of Islam is the best ?) Replied the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم): "Those from whose hands and tongue the Muslims are safe".

Imām Abū Dā'ūd in his Sunnan selected 4,800 *aḥādīth* out of a total of half a million. Out of these again he chose four, since he believed that these *aḥādīth* are sufficient for man for following the tenets of Islam. These are: for reforming prayers; "انما الاعمال بالنیات" for safeguarding the precious moments of one's life ; "من حسن اسلام المرء ترک مالا یعنیه" for paying proper dues to fellow human beings, "لایؤمن احدکم حتیٰ یحب لاخیه ما یحب لنفسه" and in order to abstain from doubts, "الحلال بین والحرام بین وما بینهما مشتبهات فمن اتقی الشبهات فقداستبرأ لدینه"

Although this selection became associated with the name of Imām Abū Dā'ūd and gained publicity, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah earlier had told his son, Ḥammād, that he had chosen five *aḥādīth* out of half a million. In addition to the four *aḥādīth*, he selected another "المسلم من سلم المسلمون من لسانه و یده". Imām Abū Dā'ūd was a great admirer of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, and it is quite possible that this selection might have been based on the former's selection.

CHAPTER VI

To feed the people is a characteristic of Islam.

11. We have been told by 'Amr bin Khālid who said that he was informed by Layth via Yazīd via Abil Khayr via

✱Abdullāh bin 'Amr that he (the last narrator) said: A person asked the Prophet of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) "What kind (or characteristic) of Islam is excellent?" He said: "You feed the people and *salām* everyone (a Muslim) whether you know him or you do not."

بَابٌ اِطْعَامُ الطَّعَامِ مِنَ الْاِسْلَامِ

11- حَدَّثَنَا عَمْرُو بْنُ خَالِدٍ قَالَ ثَنَا اللَّيْثُ عَنْ يَزِيْدَ عَنْ اَبِي الْخَيْرِ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ عَمْرٍو اَنَّ رَجُلًا سَاَلَ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اَيُّ الْاِسْلَامِ خَيْرٌ قَالَ تُطْعِمُ الطَّعَامَ وَتَقْرَءُ السَّلَامَ عَلٰى مَنْ عَرَفْتَ وَمَنْ لَّمْ تَعْرِفْ ❊

وتقرءالسلام

It is common in the people of every nation that when a person meets another person he offers him salutations. As for example, the Hindūs say, "Jeyrāmjee" and the Christians say, "Good morning." The mode of salutation varies from one people to the other and it is instinctive with man.

Greetings (*Salām*) the best gift

Islam has also given to the Muslims, the best gift which is السلام علیکم یا سلام علیکم ("Peace be on you"). This salutation is more significant in its import and better than all salutations obtainable in other nations of the world.

This mode, besides being a form of prayer, also has the advantage of the transmission of the assurance of Peace from one person to the other, showing that there is no possibility of bad intentions from his side with the result of satisfying each other that each of them wishes well for the other and bears no enmity towards him. The other party is thus rendered free from anxiety. This is the mode of salutation to be adopted also when one enters the house of other. Consequently, Allāh says:

يا أيها الذين آمنوا لا تدخلوا بيوتا
غير بيوتكم حتى تستأنسوا وتسلموا على
أهلها (سورۂ نور، آیت ۲۷)

O ye who believe! Enter not houses other than your own without first announcing your presence and invoking peace upon the folk thereof. (Qur'ān, 24:27)

The mode of greeting in Islam *salām* had its beginning in Prophet Ādam (عليه السلام). This was the mode of greeting enjoined upon Prophet Ādam (عليه السلام), and therefore the *Ḥadīth* has:

فلما خلقه قال اذهب فسلم على
أولئك النفر وهم نفر الملائكة إلى قوله
فذهب فقال السلام عليكم - الحديث

(When God created Prophet Ādam), He said: "Go and greet the company of angels." And Prophet Ādam went and greeted the angels with *Assalāmo 'Alaykum* "peace be upon you".

From this it is evident that this "تحیه" (salutation) is not particular to Islam alone but is a natural demand of a man.

Greetings from God and Salutations Among the Inhabitants of Paradise

This would also be the mode of salutation among those who would inhabit Paradise: God says:

وتحيتهم فيها سلام (یونس، آیت ۱۰)

...and their greeting therein will be: Peace. (Qur'ān, 10:10)

God, the Exalted also, not as a matter of prayer, but in order to bless the inhabitants of the Paradise with His Benevolence and Beneficence and with good tidings of favour and peace from Him, shall address them with this very salutation. God, accordingly, has said:

سلام قولا من رب رحيم (یٰس آیت ۵۸)

The word from a Merciful Lord (for them) is: Peace! (Qur'ān, 36:58)

In the world as well, God has sent greetings and *salāms* to members of the family of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and some of his Companions, by way of special honour and reverence. It is narrated in *Ḥadīth* that God sent His *salām* (Salutations) to Ḥaḍrat Khadījah al-Kubrā (رضی الله عنها). This has bestowed excellence and distinction to her over the entire *ummah* (body of followers). Here, too, *salām* (salutation) does not mean prayer but honour and reverence.

***Salām* by the Angels**

The same mode of greeting prevails among the angels. We see in the *Ḥadīth* that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) told Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah:

هذا جبريل يقرأ عليك السلام

Here is Jibra'īl who is offering you *salām* (Salutation).

The angels greeted some of the Companions also by way of *salām*. Thus, the mode of greeting "تحیه" which has come to Islam is such an exalted gift that it is the Attribute of Greeting concerning God, and is the mode of salutation of our greatest grandfather, Prophet Ādam (عليه السلام). It would be the *salām* of the dwellers of Paradise and, conventionally also, it is an excellent gift. The same mode has now become peculiar to Islam and we have, therefore, in the Qur'ān:

ولا تقولوا لمن ألقى إليكم السلام لست
مؤمنا، (النساء، آیت ۹۴)

...and say not unto one who offereth you peace: "Thou art not a believer."

(Qur'ān, 4:94)

Salām has thus become a natural habit of the *mu'min*. The descent of this *Āyah*, too, has been under similar circumstances. Likewise, the *Ḥadīth* says: "علی من عرفت ومن لم تعرف" "You must greet every Muslim, that is, whether he is personally known to you or not." One *ḥadīth* has predicted that, when the time of the Day of Judgement draws near, *salām* will be limited to a few who know each other. This we observe today. "من عرفت" does not mean men in general but some particular Muslims, since prayers, *salām*, honour and respect are due to a Muslim only. One should not first say *salām* to a *kāfir* (infidel). A prohibition to this effect appears in a *Ḥadīth*. Should the *Kāfir* come out with the greeting first, some sentence like "هداك الله" "May God guide you", or the like, should be said. The jurists have only granted this much permission to an infidel that he can offer salutation in case he desires to put an end to inimical feelings, implying only worldly peace. Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan adjudged that, on such occasions also, the word, *salām*, should be avoided, and polite words like Ādāb (salutations) should be resorted to.

An Investigation into the Different Answers Concerning the above *Ḥadīth*

Here a doubt arises that the *ḥadīth* in the first Chapter and this *ḥadīth* concern the same question as to which qualities and characteristics of Islam should have priority in obvservance. The answers to the question have been given at two places and both are different. Only two *aḥādīth* have been reproduced here. But the collection of the *Ḥadīth*, however, contains many an authentic *ḥadīth* of this nature in which the question is either of a unitary or corresponding nature, while the answers are contradictory. For instance, Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah narrates:

> The Messenger of God (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) was asked: "What actions are the best?" He replied: "To subscribe to belief in God." He was then asked: "Which is the next?" Replied he, "To wage *jihād* in the path of God." When again asked, he said that it was *Ḥajj* that was completed with the best of intentions.

> سُئِلَ رَسُوْلُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
> اَیُّ الْاَعْمَالِ اَفْضَلُ قَالَ الْاِیْمَانُ بِاللهِ قِیْلَ
> ثُمَّ مَاذَا قَالَ الْجِهَادُ فِیْ سَبِیْلِ اللهِ قِیْلَ ثُمَّ
> مَاذَا قَالَ حَجٌّ مَّبْرُوْرٌ

The second *ḥadīth* which is due to Ḥaḍrat 'Abd Allāh bin Mas'ūd runs as follows:

I asked the Messenger of God (صلی الله علیه وسلم) what acts are the best. Another narrative has: "What are the acts that are dearest to God?". The Messenger of God replied: "To offer prayer at the appointed time." I then asked: "Which is the next?" He said: "To respect your parents." Then I asked him further, and he said that it was *jihād* in the cause of God.

Just as in the two *aḥādīth* we are discussing, the question is of an identical nature, so, in these two *aḥādīth* also the nature of the question is one. The question which occurs in all the four *aḥādīth* is almost of identical significance. But the replies are different.

In order to resolve this issue, we shall first take up the two *aḥādīth* which are under discussion. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has quoted Kirmānī's reply that, although, superficially, the replies given in both are different, the ultimate significance of both is the same: one is dependent upon the other. As for example, feeding is for the benefit of the person who is being fed, since it does not happen that the host begins thrashing his guest. This is particularly known of the Arabs that even if a murderer is the guest, he is not taken to account so long as he is the guest, although the feelings of prejudice and revenge of the Arabs are proverbial. In the same way *Salām* is a pre-requisite to peaceful expression by the tongue since it is never so that one resorts to abusing immediately after offering greetings. The answer, according to Kirmānī, is that just as the question is identical, so the reply is, and hence, no problem.

But this reply is not very satisfactory as the arrangement of the Chapters by Bukhārī is gracefully logical. At first Imām Bukhārī formed chapter on the verbal and practical aspects, and waxing and waning of faith. For him, faith and Islam, are one, and in this Chapter, he has discussed the vital principles of Islam. He then made a chapter for matters relating to *Īmān*. He then stated about the minimum qualification and the attribute that a Muslim should possess so that he should at least desist from doing harm to his fellow Muslims. He has spoken of even a higher quality that not only should he refrain from doing harm, he should also offer help by way of feeding, praying for him, and rewarding him. He then goes to qualify him with higher status evermore that a Muslim should regard his fellow-Muslim like himself. He should do for him what he likes to do for himself. He should choose for him what he has chosen for himself. Then the description raises his status higher and higher. He should have more love for some persons and accord them preference over himself and the world such as the love for the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). With this consideration, Chapter on love for the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has been written. When love pervades the heart, thought and conception and the heart is filled with the love of the sweetheart, then the relations of the beloved too become dearer to the lover. This is just like water pouring into a basin from any bib-cock. When the basin is full, the water will overflow and wet all the ground around. By the same analogy, when the *measure* of love overflows, it seeps into all the things associated with the object of love. Accordingly, Imām Bukhārī has placed love for the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) first and then love for the *Anṣār*. This arrangement of description, stage by stage, is the best order. Both the chapters however become united, based on Ḥāfiẓ, Ibn Ḥajar's answer, and the beauty of the delicate logical arrangement is lost. Also, while Ibn Ḥajar's reply satisfies the two *aḥādīth* with which we are concerned here, it has to cope up with such questions and answers in other *aḥādīth*, and for which it is insufficient. We, therefore, need an answer that would satisfy all the *aḥādīth* of this kind.

Imām Nawawī and other exegetes of the *Ḥadīth* have countered this objection by stating that the replies vouchsafed by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) became different in conjunction with the questioners, the listeners, and the exigencies of the moments. Thus, on one occasion it was thought essential that the Muslims be cautioned from inflicting harm upon their fellow Muslims, and therefore the reply was in keeping with that situation. On other occasions greeting every Muslim and feeding were considered objects worthy of promulgation; there was some special cause behind it; hence the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) gave these two matters priority in execution. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has explained another way for it. The *ḥadīth* about feeding and saluting pertains to the period when the Emigrants came to Madīnah for the first time. This was the time when it was particularly important that

Muslims observed sympathy, generosity, hospitality, and close friendship towards each other.

An excellent explanation for the difference in answers to the same question

Just as the circumstances that governed the addressers and the audience with respect to questions in accordance with the changed times, as has been explained by the exegetes, the glory of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was manifested in different forms at different times—and this variation was subservient to the Attributes of variegation of God. This variegated glory of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) gives rise to variation and dissimilarity.

Priority as a whole or in part

However, I believe that the difference in the different replies is based not only on the different questioners, audience, and the variegated magnificence of the Holy Prophet's personality, but there is one principle which is vital in this connection. The superiority which men or acts have over others are of two kinds: (i) Total and (ii) Partial. The first kind, of course, in respect of any person or thing determines the superiority, priority and grandeur over other person or thing and which is generally recognised as such. But it is absolutely possible that despite the total superiority a person or a thing possesses, he or it may have superiority according to partial nature of priority as well, and for this particular aspect, he or it would be regarded superior. And yet, this partial superiority would not dominate the total superiority. Still there can be different reasons for superiority in the nature of partial priority because superiority does not depend upon one aspect or characteristic. It has many stages involving many reasons, causes and aspects. In the light of this example of total and partial superiority, it is quite distinct and clear that all are unanimous on the point of priority and eminence the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) enjoys over all other Prophets. This establishes the total superiority of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). But, despite this, however, there are Prophets whose priority has been proved in certain aspects, for certain reasons, status and capacities. The Qur'ān describes these partial aspects which confer priority upon them. God Himself has said:

> Of those messengers, some of whom
> We have caused to excel others.
> (Qur'ān, 2:253)
>
> تِلْكَ الرُّسُلُ فَضَّلْنَا بَعْضَهُمْ عَلٰى بَعْضٍ (بقره، آیت ۲۵۳)

The reason why Prophets excel others has been explained in the same *āyah*. Thus "منهم من کلم الله" "and of whom here are some unto whom Allāh spake" signifies the priority of the Moses. Prophet Jesus was supported with the Holy Spirit. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) himself has narrated the superiority of some Prophets because of certain reasons. *Ḥadīth* says that when the Trumpet is blown for the second time, it would be the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) who would recover first from the swoon, but he would see that Prophet Moses would be holding the Pillar of Heaven. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said this, with reference to the superiority of Moses as supported by the *Ḥadīth*. Similarly, about Prophet Ibrāhīm there is the *ḥadīth* which says that on the Day of Judgment, he would be the first to be dressed in *ḥullah*![1]

---

[1] *Ḥullah* is a dress consisting of a waist-wrapper and a cloak for the whole body.

On the same analogy the four Pious Caliphs are pre-eminent among the Companions. For which there is a complete unanimity and yet in the *Ḥadīth* we have:

Every *Ummah* has a trustworthy man, and the trustworthy man of this *ummah* is Abū 'Ubaydah bin al-Jarrāḥ.

لِكُلِّ أُمَّةٍ أَمِينٌ وَّأَمِينُ هٰذِهِ الْأُمَّةِ
أَبُوْعُبَيْدَةَ ابْنُ الْجَرَّاحِ۔

Similarly, about Abū Dhar, who kept nothing for himself and was against the accumulation of wealth, he said:

Below the sky and above the earth there is no one that is more truthful than Abū Dhar.

مَا أَظَلَّتِ الْخَضْرَاءُ وَمَا أَقَلَّتِ الْغَبْرَاءُ
أَصْدَقَ لَهْجَةً مِنْ أَبِي ذَرٍّ۔

Just like, we have, then, "اقرأ هم ابی" "The pre-eminent *qārī* (reciter) of the *ummah* is Ubayy bin Ka'b". There are many *aḥādīth* that point out to the virtues and manifestations of the noble deeds by the different Companions. Although among the Pious Caliphs Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr is the most pre-eminent by consensus, yet we have in the *Ḥadīth*.

The most rigorous, regarding God's affair, is 'Umar, the most modest is 'Uthmān, and the best qāḍī is 'Alī.

أَشَدُّهُمْ فِي أَمْرِ اللّٰهِ عُمَرُ وَأَصْدَقُهُمْ
حَيَاءً عُثْمَانُ وَأَقْضٰهُمْ عَلِيٌّ

Difference in Replies because of Variation in the stages of Pre-eminence

Let me say whether superiority in action can be established according to different aspects and characteristics of priority just like superiority is established for all these reasons among men. The same analogy applies to acts. For example, in the eyes of the *sharī'ah* an act may be so noble that it is symbolic to the status of the doer for the purpose of total superiority and then, according to some special event of partial superiority, some other act gains preference and priority and the third act likewise becomes superior and there is no contrariety. Acts have different aspects of superiority and so on.

Priority of some acts is based upon universal truth

An act is called good because of its universal recognition as a good act for everyone whether he is a Muslim or a *kāfir*, an honest Muslim or an Atheist. It is a good and an appreciable act as demanded by natural instinct and its doer is respected by each and every man. Among such acts are affection and love towards children, looking after and providing for the indigent and the helpless, enquiring after the sick, showing courteous and smiling attitude and sympathy towards others. These natural qualities have been mentioned in the Qur'ān:

It was by the mercy of Allāh that thou wast lenient with them(O Muḥammad), for if thou hadst been stern and fierce of heart, they would have dispersed from round about thee. (Qur'ān, 3:159)

فَبِمَا رَحْمَةٍ مِّنَ اللّٰهِ لِنْتَ لَهُمْ وَلَوْ كُنْتَ
فَظًّا غَلِيْظَ الْقَلْبِ لَا انْفَضُّوْا مِنْ حَوْلِكَ
(آلِ عمران آیت ۱۵۹)

The same thing goes for forgiveness and benevolence. God has therefore commanded the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) as follows:

Keep to forgiveness (O Muḥammad), and enjoin kindness, and turn away from the ignorant. (Qur'ān, 7:199)

خُذِ الْعَفْوَ وَأْمُرْ بِالْعُرْفِ وَأَعْرِضْ عَنِ
الْجَاهِلِينَ ۔ (الاعراف، آیت ۱۹۹)

Kind disposition and benevolent treatment have been enjoined by God in the following words:

The good deed and the evil deed are not alike. Repel the evil deed with one which is better, then lo! he, between whom and thee there was enmity (will become) as though he was a bosom friend. (Qur'ān, 41:34)

وَلَا تَسْتَوِي الْحَسَنَةُ وَلَا السَّيِّئَةُ ادْفَعْ
بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ فَإِذَا الَّذِي بَيْنَكَ وَبَيْنَهُ
عَدَاوَةٌ كَأَنَّهُ وَلِيٌّ حَمِيمٌ (حٰم سجدہ آیت ۳۴)

One who invites people towards God has been taught the virtuous way of morality that the good and the evil are not equal to each other. Both have different import. So, one who calls people towards God should not have an evil attitude in turn of evil. If he is confronted with a class of people having intelligence, perception, and love for knowledge, and the people given for discussion he should deal with the proper arguments so that the people should yield, and forget their self-coined philosophy who attack the truth of *Waḥī* out of their pride of knowledge and scientific achievements. Bad, abusive and harsh behaviour should be dealt with an approach of forbearance, civility and mildness. This attitude would make even the worst enemy give way. All such acts are good, viewed whether rationally or religiously or conventionally. There is nothing bad. Considered from this point of view, desisting from doing harm to others, feeding and greeting are pre-eminent. For example, *Jihād* is from the viewpoint of the *sharī'ah* a very noble act, and it has intrinsically many a wise implication, but it is not established to be wholly noble, since the opponents of Islam will not call it such. Nor is it noble from all angles, as it involves slaying and loss of lives. Our jurists, therefore, regard it not noble in itself but for some other reason.

Pre-eminence of some Acts Due to the dignified Reward in After-life

Some of the acts gain pre-eminence on account of special and guaranteed reward and (blessings from God). This is so, because such acts entail considerable exercise and hardship in devotion. The principle therefore is "العطايا على متن البلايا" "The portals of reward and recompense from God open up according to how much suffering (the faithful has undergone in His Cause." In Afterlife, therefore, the degree of recompense is of an exceedingly high degree. Considered from this angle, the most pre-eminent and the highest act is the renunciation of the so- called faith of one's forefathers and to affirm faith in God and His Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). From the age of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) down to the present age, there is no act more severe and excruciating than to renounce the faith of one which one followed onself for long and to adopt that religion which involves disgrace and degradition of their forefathers and renunciation of the idols which heretofore, he had accepted as his deities and gods. The Quraysh therefore decided to sacrifice their wealth and property, desert their own houses, and to embark on battle and bloodshed rather than renounce their ancestral faith. But they did not subscribe to faith in Allāh and His Messenger. Now anyone who foregoes the faith of the ancestors in exchange for the new faith—involving, as it does, severance from those that have been hitherto near and dear to him—has waged a magnificent battle against his own conscience. Consequently, he is entitled to a great guaranteed reward. Pre-eminent in the first degree is the renunciation of all acts that are based on kufr and to accept *īmān*. In the second degree is *jihād* in way of God, since it involves abstension from worldly interests and objects and indulgence in different kinds of sufferings, hardships and possibility of the loss of life. Recompense for *jihād* would also be of the same kind. The *Ḥajj* accepted by God (mabrūr) is in the third degree. It also involves physical and material hardships so much so that it has been called "السفر قطعة من النار" "a journey is an area of fire." One has to traverse a long distance and undergo severe kinds of hardships and tribulations in the completion of the journey. *Ḥadīth* has it as the *jihād* al-nisa (*jihād* by women). It is thus the minor *jihād* (*jihād* al-aṣghar), especially the *Ḥajj* accepted by God (Mabrūr), for it is pious and noble only when one abstains from all passions and prohibitions. It will also earn recompense in accordance with the degree of piety.

Pre-eminence of some acts Due to Extreme Humility

In addition to the foregoing aspects of pre-eminence, there is one more aspect of pre-eminence in some acts. It is the deed itself which, according to its outward nature and importance, manifests extreme devotion and subjugation to God which is the real basis of submission, and the exercise of devotion substantiates submission even more. In this respect, "الصلوة لوقتها" 'prayer at the fixed hour' is the best because no other type of prayer can submit as much of humiliation and subjugation to God as it does. Its form, from beginning to end, is such that a man becomes the symbol of humiliation and submissiveness and there is nothing more appreciable in the eyes of a master than the humbleness and obedience of his servant, while, on the contrary, there is nothing more bad than the vanity and arrogance of the servant. In the second degree falls "برالوالدين" "obedience towards parents" because they are the representatives of God in the world. God Himself has given them secondary position in terms of His rights.

God has said :

...Give thanks unto Me and unto thy parents. (Qur'ān 31:14)	اَنِ اشْكُرْ لِيْ وَلِوَالِدَيْكَ (لقمان آیت ۱۴)
Thy Lord hath decreed, that ye worship none save Him, and (that ye show) kindness to parents. (Qur'ān 17:23)	وَقَضٰى رَبُّكَ اَلَّا تَعْبُدُوْٓا اِلَّآ اِيَّاهُ وَ بِالْوَالِدَيْنِ اِحْسَانًا (بنی اسرائیل آیت ۲۳)

Pre-eminent in the third degree is obedience to Amir al-Mu'minin, the Caliph. This is best manifested through *jihād* in the path of God, since Khalīfatullah (or Caliph who rules on behalf of God) is the vicegerent of God on earth. The *ḥadīth* has: "السلطان ظل الله فی الارض" "Your ruler is the reflection of God on earth". God Himself commands :

Obey Allāh, and obey the messenger and those of you who are in authority. (Qur'ān 4:59)	اَطِيْعُوا اللّٰهَ وَاَطِيْعُوا الرَّسُوْلَ وَاُولِى الْاَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ (نساء آیت ۵۹)

The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم), in this context, has said :

Listen to him and subserve him, even though the Amīr appointed upon you is a Ḥabashī slave whose organs, nose and ears etc. are mutilated.	اِسْمَعُوْا وَاَطِيْعُوْا وَلَوِ اسْتُعْمِلَ عَلَيْكُمْ عَبْدٌ حَبَشِيٌّ مُجَدَّعُ الْاَطْرَافِ

In sum, the reasons for considering pre-eminence concerning acts are different and various. Sometimes an act gains preference over another because its beauty is universally liked. Both *Aḥadīth* reproduced by Bukhārī mention this attribute of pre-eminence. Sometimes the pre-eminence of an act derives from the fact that the act results in a magnificent reward and guaranteed blessings from God. The *Ḥadīth* quoted by Ḥadrat Abū Hurayrah mentions the ordeals and tribulations suffered by the faithful in the path of God is in the respective order. One act gains pre-eminence over other acts because it is more suitable in respect of exercise of devotion. The *Ḥadīth* narrated by Ḥadrat 'Abd Allāh bin Mas'ūd stresses this point, in order. The different versions of this *Ḥadīth* also argue this point. However, the possibility exists that variation in versions might be due to the central meaning of the *Ḥadīth*, but apparently, the words of the *Ḥadīth* are as reproduced, unless proved to the contrary. Considering it to be desirable it is stated that these words are appropriate to the meaning of the *Ḥadīth*. The first kind is therefore worthy of the good side opposed to the bad side. This kind, in reality, in appearance, in external form, and in its internal depth, and both temporally and eschatologically, would be immune to evil both for the Muslim and the non-Muslim alike. This kind appeared in response to "ای الاسلام خیر". The safety of others from one's hands and tongue belongs to this species. This Bukhārī narration was vouchsafed in response to "ای الاسلام افضل" Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim's narration contains the word, "خیر" (good) in place of "افضل" (pre-eminence) "Cast not slander upon anyone".

The second kind would be more appropriate expressed by "افضل" 'pre-eminent' since it carries greater significance than "فضل" 'excellent' the antonym of which is "نقص" "defect". This species carries greater reward and blessings on account of involving greater labour and suffering, and, therefore, appeared forth in response to "ای الاعمال افضل".

All these *Aḥādīth* belong to different periods; the questioner and the audience were different as well. The magnificent manifestations of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) also varied. The reasons of pre-eminence and some traditions and answers are also different. If there is variation in replies, what is the point of doubt ?

CHAPTER VII

It is part of *Imān* (Faith) to love for brother what one loves for oneself.

12. We have been told by Musaddad who said that he was informed by Yaḥyā via Shu'bah via Qatādah via Anas who heard the Prophet of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say: (According to another chain of transmitters) Yaḥyā narrated it from Ḥusayn al-Mu'allim who said that he was informed by Qatādah via:

✱Anas who (the latter) heard the Prophet of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihī wa sallam*) say: "None of you will be a Believer until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself:

بَابٌ ٧ مِنَ الْإِيْمَانِ أَنْ يُحِبَّ لِأَخِيْهِ
مَا يُحِبُّ لِنَفْسِهِ

12 - حَدَّثَنَا مُسَدَّدٌ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى عَنْ
شُعْبَةَ عَنْ قَتَادَةَ عَنْ أَنَسٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ وَعَنْ حُسَيْنٍ
الْمُعَلِّمِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا قَتَادَةُ عَنْ أَنَسٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى
اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ لَا يُؤْمِنُ أَحَدُكُمْ حَتّٰى يُحِبَّ
لِأَخِيْهِ مَا يُحِبُّ لِنَفْسِهِ

A mu'min should not be jealous. His aim should always be to make other Muslims also co-sharer in all good things. This is one of the essentials of *īmān*. The *Ḥadīth* reproduced in this chapter points to the sacred programme of action of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) according to which the Muslim society should have within it people who bear love and affection towards each other and who look after the well being of each other. It is obvious that when such society is formed, how peaceful their life would be.

"None of you is worthy of the appellation of mu'min لَا يُؤْمِنُ اَحَدُكُمْ nor of being called as such, until and unless he likes for his Muslim brother what he would like to have for himself." There are certain points of dubiety in connection with the determination of the meaning of this *Ḥadīth* and therefore must be made clear.

Dubiety No. 1 and its answer

"What one would like to have for one self, is generally known. If any sinner is given to drinking and he likes it for himself, would it be desirable that others too should take to drinking according to his liking and that the whole world should start drinking? This problem is resolved by an additional word which occurs in Nasāī's narrative. This is as follows: "حتى يحب لاخيه من الخير ما يحب لنفسه" "What is good temporally or eschatologically, the insertion of the word, "خير", removes all forbidden and iniquitous things. But even if we do not accept the prop of the word, "خير", this problem should not have any dubiety as any *mu'min* cannot like the prohibitions.

The second problem is concerning the implication of the sentence. If it means that he should withdraw the possession of a thing in favour of his Muslim brother it would be improper. Which rich person would wish that he be deprived of his property and it should go to some one else and he should be poor ? If the meaning is that what he has, should remain with him and he should not be deprived of it, and that his brother Muslim should also have the same property as appears from the apparent construction of the words, this would again be impossible, since it is not possible according to reason. The answer to this difficulty is that actual implication of the words of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is as follows "ان يحب ان يحصل لاخيه نظير ما يحصل له عينه سواء كان فى الامور المحسوسة اوالمعنوية" that is to say, one should wish that one's fellow Muslim should have what one has, whether it be of the species of the objects of sense or of implications. It does not imply that one's Muslim brother would get what one possesses oneself.

The third problem would be as follows : Let us accept this as illustration (naẓīr) ; but if we accept it as such, it would pre-suppose that all people in the world would be of equal rank. There would be no distinction between a big man and a small man. If one is a king, would it be possible that according to his desire, all should be kings and that a teacher or a merchant desires that all his fellow-Muslims should become teachers or merchants ? How can the affairs of the world be managed ?

The Meaning of *Ḥadīth*, "حتى يحب لاخيه"

The reply to the third objection lies in the proper understanding of the *Ḥadīth*. The *Ḥadīth* could have two implications :

(i) One should expect for others what one expects for one self. If one expects that others should behave properly and politely towards one self, one should also extend the reciprocity of such behaviour towards others. Do not follow the example of *muṭaffifīn* (those who exercise less measure than what is prescribed).

> (Those) who when they take the measure from mankind, demand it full. But if they measure unto them or weigh for them, they cause them less.
> (Qur'ān, 83:2-3)

إِذَا اكْتَالُوْا عَلَى النَّاسِ يَسْتَوْفُوْنَ ۝ وَ
إِذَا كَالُوْهُمْ أَوْ وَّزَنُوْهُمْ يُخْسِرُوْنَ (تطفيف آيت ٢-٣)

Defrauding could prevail in all our acts. This meaning is supported by a *ḥadīth* quoted in the Musnad of Imām Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal. A man called on the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and said he wished to embrace Islam, but that he should be allowed to commit adultery, as he could not do without women. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) asked him to sit close to himself and asked him how he would feel if his own mother, or sister or daughter wished to have sexual relations with a stranger. The man said he would wield his sword against such a man. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), thereupon, said that the woman with whom he would conduct this adulterous relationship would be the mothers or sisters or daughters of someone. What the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) meant was that, if he did not wish that his own mother, sister, or daughter should have illicit relationship with another man, he should apply the same norm to himself. This is the ultimate implication of the meaning of this chapter.

The second implication of the *Ḥadīth* is that one should regard a Muslim as one's own brother and choose for him what one would choose for oneself if one were in the other person's circumstances. If, for example, you are a lecturer of the Bukhārī Sharīf and a peasant comes to you for certain advice, would you choose for him the Bukhārī Sharīf which would be of little benefit to him, considering his vocation and his outlook on life? Would it not be better that you would place yourself in the peasant's stead and think what you would have chosen for yourself were you in his place? Seeking and pursuing what appeals to others and the like—this is the modus operandi of the *ḥadīth*. Now there is no problem.

This author recalls a parable from Imām Ghazālī's *Iḥyā al-'Ulūm*:

> Some one complained his house was infested with rats. He was told he should keep a cat. He said: "I have the fear that, if the rats hear the mewing of the cat, they would scamper into the adjoining houses. And what I like not for myself, I do not like for others."

إِنَّهٗ شَكٰى بَعْضُهُمْ كَثْرَةَ الْفَارِ فِيْ دَارِهٖ
فَقِيْلَ لَهٗ لَوِ اقْتَنَيْتَ هِرًّا (أَيْ لَوِ اتَّخَذْتَهٗ) فَقَالَ
أَخْشٰى أَنْ يَّسْمَعَ الْفَارُ صَوْتَ الْهِرِّ فَيَهْرُبُ
إِلٰى دُوْرِ الْجِيْرَانِ فَأَكُوْنُ قَدْ أَحْبَبْتُ لَهُمْ مَّا
لَا أُحِبُّ لِنَفْسِيْ ۔

In the *Ḥadīth* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) there is always the tone of instruction so that people may incline towards action to the maximum degree. Such *aḥādīth* in which *īmān* is vitiated without any practical deed are the indicators of the fact that what is vitiated is equivalent to the state of non-existence. Some exegetes come out with the explanation that such a *Ḥadīth* implies perfection. But such an interpretation makes the *Ḥadīth* meaningless and the objective almost stands cancelled. "لا يؤمن" has been said only because the aim is to emphasise the desire for action, while such an interpretation would invalidate the desire for action. This *ḥadīth* seems to be directed against the sentiment of jealousy as well, as the glory of the *mu'min* lies in his choosing for his brother what he prefers for himself. Seeing him in a good state, why would he desire that his Muslim brother should lose what he possesses?

CHAPTER VIII

To love the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) is part of Faith.

13. We have been told by Abūl Yamān who said that he was informed by Shu'ayb who said: Abūl Zinād told us on the authority of al-A'raj who heard:

✶ Abū Hurayrah say: The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "By Him in whose hands is my life, none of you can be (true) Believer unless I am dearer (and nearer) to him than his father and his children."

14. We have been told by Ya'qūb bin Ibrāhīm who said that he was informed by Ibn 'Ulayyah via 'Abdul 'Azīz bin Ṣuhayb on the authority of:

Anas who heard the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say: And through another chain of transmitters: Ādam bin Abī Iyās told us that Shu'bah informed him on the authority of Qatādah who heard:

✶ Anas (*raḍī allāh 'anho*) say:

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: None of you will be a (true) Believer unless I am dearer (and nearer) to him than his father and his children and all other people.

بَابٌ حُبُّ الرَّسُوْلِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مِنَ الْاِيْمَانِ

13- حَدَّثَنَا اَبُو الْيَمَانِ قَالَ ثَنَا شُعَيْبٌ قَالَ ثَنَا اَبُو الزِّنَادِ عَنِ الْاَعْرَجِ عَنْ اَبِیْ هُرَيْرَةَ اَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ وَالَّذِیْ نَفْسِیْ بِيَدِهٖ لَا يُؤْمِنُ اَحَدُكُمْ حَتّٰى اَكُوْنَ اَحَبَّ اِلَيْهِ مِنْ وَّالِدِهٖ وَوَلَدِهٖ ٭

14- حَدَّثَنَا يَعْقُوْبُ بْنُ اِبْرَاهِيْمَ قَالَ ثَنَا ابْنُ عُلَيَّةَ عَنْ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيْزِ بْنِ صُهَيْبٍ عَنْ اَنَسٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ح وَحَدَّثَنَا اٰدَمُ بْنُ اَبِیْ اِيَاسٍ قَالَ ثَنَا شُعْبَةُ عَنْ قَتَادَةَ عَنْ اَنَسٍ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لَا يُؤْمِنُ اَحَدُكُمْ حَتّٰى اَكُوْنَ اَحَبَّ اِلَيْهِ مِنْ وَّالِدِهٖ وَوَلَدِهٖ وَالنَّاسِ اَجْمَعِيْنَ ٭

Love is a useful and beneficial capital. The real benefit of this capital has been mentioned in the above-quoted Ahādīth. In other words, love for the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) makes it easy to obey him and follow him. "Indeed, a lover by his nature obeys the beloved." In the first Ḥadīth, "father and child" are mentioned but mankind is intended as it is specified in the second Ḥadīth (referring to entire mankind). We must love the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) far more than we love ourselves. Various Aḥādīth express this point in clear terms. Ḥaḍrat 'Umar's Ḥadīth is well-known on this subject. One *Ḥadīth* says, "احب اليه مما سواهما" (I am dearer to him than the things other than the two). Here whole mankind is referred to. Though love for the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) only is mentioned in the Ḥadīth, love for Allāh and His Apostle (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is intended, because love for Allāh is the chief object.

It is generally observed that natural love apparently dominates احب اليه to such an extent that other kinds of love are eclipsed, but the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) says that Allāh and His Apostle (صلى الله عليه وسلم) must be loved most of all. Domination of natural love is something involuntary. For example, love for one's child is natural. Not only mankind, but the similar sentiment is inherent in animals also. All existing beings are bound to have such love, so much so that if a mother wishes to get rid of love for her child, she cannot. When love for father and child is natural and spontaneous, Love for Allāh, the Exalted, and Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) must be still greater and deeper Apparently this thing seems to be fallacious and not practicable. Hence I explain the point here in detail to remove the aforesaid fallacy. I describe below various types of love and its causes so as to ascertain how love is generated in the world.

The meaning and kinds of love

In the first instance we ought to know what the word "Muḥabbat" (i.e. love) literally means. Literally "Muḥabbat" signifies inclination of mind towards any thing or any tasteful matter. Imām Rāghib says that "Muḥabbat" means a will to obtain what one thinks good for oneself—either with certainty or probability. Hence will (or intention) is an essential part of love. The object of this intention, according to some people, is something tasteful and according to others, something good.

Natural love

The source of love is sometimes involuntary as parents love for their children. This is called "Natural Love" "حب طبعی". As the cause of natural love is involuntary, this kind of love is spontaneous. The chief source of natural love is nearness. The nearer the relationship, the deeper ls the extent of love. Parents and children are the nearest in relationship, because children are part and parcel of parents. Consequently their love is the deepest. As man loves his hands and eyes so he loves his real brothers more than other relatives i.e. the nearest, and then the next. Anyhow, when the source of love is involuntary, it is called natural love. Sometimes love is voluntary, and it has various forms, as under:

Love due to Favours

Sometimes the cause of love and attachment is the favour of benefactors, "because man is a slave of benefactors." It is our experience that one of the main causes of love is kindness and favours. Reference may be made to the episode of Caliph Māmūn al-Rashīd and his minister Ja'far Barmakī who was very intelligent. One day the Caliph told his minister, "I shall give you whatever you ask me." The latter said, "Sir, I pray that you please begin to love my son." The Caliph surprisingly said, "What you have said is not reasonable. Is love a voluntary affair so that I begin to love your son?" The minister replied, "The source and cause of love may be voluntary also. Kindly bestow favours on my son, and then the sentiment of love will be generated in his mind towards your goodself, and ultimately you will also have some place for him in your heart." Caliph Māmūn al-Rashīd was exceedingly pleased with this intelligent reply.

In short, benevolence is one of the causes of love and affection. As sympathy and kindness is a voluntary act, love generated thereby will be also voluntary. For convenience sake this love may be termed as "حب احسانی" "i.e. love as a result of benefaction".

Love due to beauty

Sometimes the source of love is beauty. Beauty either of appearance or character or voice is attractive. Though love due to beauty is not voluntary, its cause is voluntary, e.g., to look at some person, to listen to his voice or talk to him, etc. Hence this sort of love may also be called voluntary. On the contrary, parents' or children's love is spontaneous in all cases, which does not need any external cause. For convenience sake, love due to beauty may be called "حب جمالی" "i.e. love of beauty".

Love on account of merits

Sometimes the cause of love is somebody's accomplishments. We feel some sort of attachment and affection for a person who is highly accomplished though we are not indebted to him or attracted by his beautiful appearance. Very often we begin to love and venerate a person by hearing about his wonderful achievements without even seeing him. Sometimes the sentiment of love and affection is generated in our minds by reading the life-work of the highly qualified persons of early times. Here also the causes of love, viz, to hear the events of one's achievements and to ponder over them, are voluntary matters. This kind of love may be termed as "حب کمالی" "love due to accomplishment" for convenience sake.

Love based on reason

Sometimes the source of love is intellect and reason only. Somethings are distasteful by nature, and yet they are sought and obtained, e.g., bitter medicines with bad smell for a sick person, hardship of long journey for merchants and other tedious and troublesome work for some people. Baydāwī, Khaṭṭābī and others have named this kind of love as "حب عقلی" as the basis of this love is reason only, because a man by exercising his wisdom decides that certain acts are advantageous to him and after considering them carefully seeks to obtain them. As this whole process is voluntary, this love is also voluntary. In short, one type of love is involuntary and that is natural love, and the other types of love are voluntary and on account of different causes they are differently named, such as "حب احسانی" "حب جمالی" "حب کمالی" "حب عقلی".

What kind of love is intended in this *Ḥadīth* ?

Love mentioned in the above-quoted ***Ḥadīth*** is not natural love, because it is spontaneous and involuntary, and this is not obligatory for man. In ***Ḥadīth*** that kind of love is referred to, which is based on reason only, as said by Khaṭṭābī. Every Muslim must love the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) and believe that it is essential for him to love Allāh, and for love of Allāh it is necessary to obey and love the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). In this case "حب احسانی" is also involved because the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has conferred favours on Believers inasmuch as he tried his best to lead them to the right path leading to Eternal salvation. Further, "حب کمالی" is also applicable here, because Believers are apt to keep in mind all superhuman achievements of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). In the beginning love of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is voluntary and based on reason only but we should not remain content with it. We must try to improve this type of love to such an extent that all kinds of natural love may be eclipsed thereby.

This perfect love is intended in the above-quoted *Ḥadīth*. Our love is incomplete or defective as long as we do not attain to its zenith of perfection. It is our experience that in the beginning love of something is voluntary and based on reason only, but gradually it surpasses natural and spontaneous love. In such cases some people sacrifice all other kinds of inclination and love. Innumerable events of the Companions of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) bear testimony to the above. Even the enemies of Islam admit that the extraordinary devotion and attachment of Prophet's Companions to Allāh and His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) were unique and unparalleled in human history.

An example of love by wisdom and love by Faith

Ḥadrat Zayd bin Wathnah was taken prisoner along with Ḥadrat Khubayb in the battle of Rajī'. When the infidels intended to kill the former, Abū Sufyān who was then the chief of the unbelievers, told him some thing (vide *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* page 221). When Ḥadrat Zayd replied, Abū Sufyān surprisingly uttered :

"I have not seen any person who loves another person to the extent that the Holy Prophet's Companions love him."

مَارَاَيْتُ اَحَدًا مِّنَ النَّاسِ يُحِبُّ اَحَدًا كَحُبِّ اَصْحَابِ مُحَمَّدٍ مُّحَمَّدًا صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

An Ansari Woman

An Anṣārī woman's father, brother and husband participated in the battle of Uḥad. A considerable number of Muslims was killed (and thus became martyrs). The woman went round in the battlefield enquiring about the fate of her relatives. When she was informed that all of them were killed, she did not utter a single word. Afterwards she asked about the welfare of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and later she was told that he was quite safe by the grace of Allāh, she exclaimed, "Show me so that I may see him personally." When she saw the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) she said, "All calamities are now insignificant for me." The advice given by Ḥaḍrat 'Umar (*raḍī allāho 'anho*) about the prisoners of the battle of Badr is too well-known to be related here. A son of Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq (*raḍī allāho 'anho*), 'Abdur Raḥmān by name, participated in the battle of Badr against the Muslims because he had not embraced Islam by that time. On one occasion 'Abdur Raḥmān came face to face with his father (Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq). The latter asked the Holy Prophet's permission to kill his son, but he refused to permit him. When the chief of hypocrites, 'Abdullāh bin Ubayy said :

"Surely, if we return to al-Madīnah, the mightier will soon drive out the weaker"
(Qur'ān 63-8)

لَئِنْ رَّجَعْنَآ اِلَى الْمَدِيْنَةِ لَيُخْرِجَنَّ
الْاَعَزُّ مِنْهَا الْاَذَلَّ (المنٰفقون آيت ۸)

his own son Ḥaḍrat 'Abdullāh, who was a sincere Muslim, said to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "Please permit me so that I may bring my father's head before you just now." But the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not agree.

'Abdullah bin Zayd bin 'Abdi Rabbihi

Ḥaḍrat 'Abdullāh bin Zayd bin 'Abdi Rabbihī was in his garden when a certain person apprised him of the demise of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). He was so much shocked by the news that he prayed to Allāh saying: "O my Lord! take away my eye-sight, because I do not like to see any person with my eyes after the death of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)." As prayer was made from the core of heart, it was accepted, and he was deprived of eye-sight.

Hadrat 'Abdullah bin Hadhafah Sahmi

Ḥaḍrat 'Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah Sahmī was taken prisoner by the Romans along with some other Muslims. As the Christian King was informed that the Believers' faith was unshakable like mountain, he wanted to test this statement. He called 'Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah Sahmī and said to him, "If you give up your religion and accept Christianity, I shall marry my daughter to you and bestow on you a part of my kingdom". He replied, "You are offering me inducements. If you confer on me the empire of seven continents, I shall never accept it". When the Roman king saw that no amount of inducement could affect the prisoner, he began to torture him and put him in jail and stopped his food. When his agony became unbearable wine and swine were placed before him. Although in cases of emergency it is lawful for a Muslim to use forbidden things, he ('Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah) refused to eat swine and drink wine, because he thought that by using them they would bring discredit to the religion of Islam. The king again called him and repeated his inducements to him. But he again refused to submit. Then the king threw another prisoner into fire in the presence of 'Abdullāh and told him, "Do as I order you to do, otherwise you will be also thrown into fire." He again refused to obey. When 'Abdullāh was about to be thrown into fire, tears came out of his eyes. The king assumed that he was weeping out of fear, and, therefore, recalled him and said, "It is likely that you will accept my proposal now". He replied, "You are mistaken. I do not fear for my life, but I feel that I am sacrificing a very insignificant thing (viz. my life) in the way of Allāh. Had there been life at the root of every hair of my body, I would have gladly sacrificed all lives in the name of Allāh." The king then said to him "If you once kiss my forehead (as a mark of respect) then I shall set you free." He asked the king whether this offer was for him alone or for all Muslim prisoners. The king at last agreed to set free all prisoners. 'Abdullāh did not comply with the king's proposal for the sake of his life, but he did so in order to save his fellow prisoners. He, therefore, kissed the king's forehead and returned to Madīnah along with other Muslim prisoners.

This event took place during the Caliphate of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar (رضی الله عنه). When he came to know of it, he directed all Muslims to receive 'Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah and kiss his forehead. The Caliph himself escorted the people outside the town of Madīnah and kissed his forehead with due respect and honour. The examples of sacrifices of the Holy Prophet's Companions in the way of Allāh are innumerable and are recorded in history. In short, natural love is vanquished by sincere love for Islam and its Founder, Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم).

Love for Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is included in Love for Allah

Love for the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) may also be natural, based on relationship, as Abū Ṭālib loved his nephew exceedingly. But this love was due to relationship only. Love for the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) may be due to his incomparable beauty. As Zulaykhā loved Prophet Joseph (علیه السلام), some people may love the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) for the same consideration. Love for the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) may be due to his unequalled merits and accomplishments also. Even some Europeans hold him in the highest esteem. Once in America a series of articles were contributed on the "Greatest man of the world," in which majority of writers said that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was the greatest man. But real love for the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is based on belief in Allāh, and whoever wishes to love Allāh must also love the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم); because he is a midway between the Maker and the made and between Essential and Possible. Allāh has conferred His favours and blessings on His creatures through His Apostle (صلی الله علیه وسلم). If any person loves Allāh while ignoring the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) his love will not carry any weight. In refutation of such claims of the unbelievers the Holy Qur'ān says:

Say, (O Muḥammad to mankind): if ye love Allāh, follow me; Allāh will love you. (Qur'ān, 3:31)	قُلْ اِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُحِبُّوْنَ اللّٰهَ فَاتَّبِعُوْنِيْ يُحْبِبْكُمُ اللّٰهُ (آلِ عمران آیت ۳۱)

Thus we see that love for the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is included in love for Allāh. Abul Qāsim Qushayrī narrated it from a great Ṣufī, Abū Sa'īd Khazār, that the latter had seen the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) in dream and told him.

Love of Allāh has absorbed me too much to love you.	شَغَلَتْنِیْ مَحَبَّةُ اللّٰهِ عَنْ مَّحَبَّتِكَ

i.e., Love of Allāh has taken possession of every part of my heart, and now there is no space left therein for you. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) replied.

O mad man whoever loves Allāh really loves me also.	يَا مُبَارَكُ مَنْ اَحَبَّ اللّٰهَ فَقَدْ اَحَبَّنِیْ

The Prophet's reply may be explained in two ways, viz.

(i) It is some sort of consolation. In other words, whoever loves Allāh automatically loves His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) also. If a person is absorbed in Allāh's love to such an extent that he does not get an opportunity to love His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), even then love of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is inherent in his love of Allāh.

(ii) It is some kind of warning. In other words, Allāh's love necessitates love of His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) also, and one must try to love the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) also. In the Prophet's reply the word "Mubārak" might mean one who lacked wisdom, i.e., the aforesaid Ṣufī's expression did not stand reason.

In short, that love of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) will be beneficial and substantial which is based on belief in Allāh and His religion. For convenience sake this kind of love may be called 'حب ایمانی' "Love due to belief". Qasṭalānī has so named it. This love is a part of "حب عقلی" "Love due to reason only", because it is reason which dictates that love of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is indispensable for love of Allāh. Anyhow, this love is called "حب ایمانی" as well as "حب الہی" "Divine love". There is one *Ḥadīth* in Tirmidhī and Ḥākim.

Love Allāh because He confers His favours on you, and love me on account of love of Allāh and love the members of my family for my sake.	اَحِبُّوا اللّٰهَ لِمَا يَغْذُوْكُمْ مِّنْ نِّعَمِهٖ وَ اَحِبُّوْنِیْ لِحُبِّ اللّٰهِ وَ اَحِبُّوْا اَهْلَ بَيْتِیْ لِحُبِّیْ ، (جَامِعُ صغیر)

Tirmidhī and Ḥākim have said that this *Ḥadīth* is correct, and Dhahbī has confirmed it in "تلخیص" (Talkhīs).

The gist of this *Ḥadīth* is that our love of belief for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) must be perfect, as all other types of love are insignificant in comparison with it. Perfect belief demands that we must love the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) from the core of our hearts, and in our practical lives we must act upto the commandments of Allāh and His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) to the best of our abilities. The Holy Qur'ān says :

Say (O Muḥammad) : If your fathers, and your sons, and your brethren, and your wives, and your tribe, and the wealth ye have acquired, and merchandise for which ye fear that there will be no sale, and dwellings ye desire are dearer to you than Allāh and His Messenger and striving in His way: then wait till Allāh bringeth His command to pass. (Qur'ān 9:24)	قُلْ اِنْ كَانَ اٰبَآؤُكُمْ وَاَبْنَآؤُكُمْ وَ اِخْوَانُكُمْ وَاَزْوَاجُكُمْ وَعَشِيْرَتُكُمْ وَاَمْوَالُ ِۨاقْتَرَفْتُمُوْهَا وَتِجَارَةٌ تَخْشَوْنَ كَسَادَهَا وَمَسٰكِنُ تَرْضَوْنَهَآ اَحَبَّ اِلَيْكُمْ مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَرَسُوْلِهٖ وَجِهَادٍ فِیْ سَبِيْلِهٖ فَتَرَبَّصُوْا حَتّٰى يَاْتِیَ اللّٰهُ بِاَمْرِهٖ (التوبہ، آیت ۲۴)

Qadi 'Ayad and Qurtabi's interpretation

The gist of the above discussion is that in the absence of "حب ایمانی" (love due to Faith) all other kinds of love, such as 'حب طبعی' 'natural love', "حب جمالی" "love for beauty", "حب کمالی" (love due to merits) or 'حب احسانی' (love as a mark of gratitude), will have no value. It is, however, correct that different types of love strengthen "حب ایمانی". Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ refers to this type of love as love of respect and veneration. Qurṭabī refutes this view as respect and honour of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is prerequisite for belief. Anyhow, love mentioned in the Ḥadīth quoted above, is the basis of perfect belief and not of simple belief.

Objection and its reply regarding Hadrat 'Umar's Hadith

A Ḥadīth in Bukhārī Sharīf "کتاب الایمان و النذر" says that one day Ḥaḍrat 'Umar told the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

"You are dearer to me than all things save myself." The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said, "By Him in Whose hands my life is, you cannot be a (true) Believer until I am dearer to you than yourself also." Then Ḥaḍrat 'Umar replied: "Now sir, you are dearer to me than myself" "Now it is alright O 'Umar", retorted the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).

لَأَنْتَ يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ أَحَبُّ إِلَيَّ مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ إِلَّا مِنْ نَفْسِيْ فَقَالَ لَا وَالَّذِيْ نَفْسِيْ بِيَدِهٖ حَتّٰى أَكُوْنَ أَحَبَّ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ نَفْسِكَ فَقَالَ لَهٗ عُمَرُ فَإِنَّكَ الْآنَ وَاللّٰهِ أَحَبُّ إِلَيَّ مِنْ نَفْسِيْ فَقَالَ الْآنَ يَا عُمَرُ۔

Commentators of Aḥādīth generally maintain that this الا من نفسی phrase means that Ḥaḍrat 'Umar did not previously hold the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) in greater love than himself. But I am not satisfied with this explanation. Ḥaḍrat 'Umar occupied the second highest place in the Muslim community, next to Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq only. It is below his dignity to suppose that he did not love the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) more than himself. It is well known that it was Ḥaḍrat 'Umar who openly and publicly offered prayers immediately after embracing Islam while other Muslims said prayers privately. When he intended to migrate to Madīnah he announced publicly his intention before the Quraysh and risked his life for the sake of religion. How could such a daring and enthusiastic believer love the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) less than himself?

In my opinion the expression "الا من نفسی" (i.e. but myself) does not mean that he gave the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) a second place in his heart. What Ḥaḍrat 'Umar meant was that he held the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) in the highest esteem (in preference to all persons and things) with certainty, but with regard to his self he was not sure either in affirmation or negation. The interpretation signifies that Ḥaḍrat 'Umar did not prefer himself to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) in respect of love and veneration.

Beauty of Hadrat 'Umar's statement

Ḥaḍrat 'Umar did not specify the nature and depth of his love for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), as he desired that the Prophet himself might be pleased to take initiation in the matter. When he was kind enough to tell him ('Umar) that for a true Believer it was essential to love him most of all (including self), he was exceedingly pleased to know that the target of his love was much higher than he thought hitherto, and he joyfully said addressing the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), "You are dearer to me now than myself." As a true and sincere lover, Ḥadrat 'Umar gave the first and foremost place to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) in his heart, and sacrificed himself in the way of Allāh and His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

Results of love

A person once asked the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) as to when the Day of Resurrection would come. In reply he enquired what preparations he had made for that Day. He said : "Sir, I have neither offered prayers in plenty nor observed fast in abundance nor paid alms regularly, but this much is certain that I love Allāh, the Most Exalted, and His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم)." The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) replied, "On the Day of Resurrection you will be with those whom you love". Maulānā Syed Anwar Shāh says that love for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) should not be confined to his merits and proficiency only but for his august person also, because he is an object of love both for his qualities and for his person.

CHAPTER IX TASTE OF FAITH

15. We have been told by Muḥammad bin al-Muthānnā who said that he was informed by 'Abdul Wahhāb alThaqafī who said: Ayyūb narrated the following via Abū Qilābah who heard Ḥadrat Anas say :

★ The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said "whosoever is imbued with three qualities will taste the sweetness of Faith. These are :

(i) Allāh and His Apostle are dearer to him than all else;
(ii) he loves the people provided that such love shall be for Allāh's sake only and
(iii) he hates to revert to disbelief as he hates to be thrown into the fire (of hell) "

باب حلاوة الإيمان

15- حدثنا محمد بن المثنى قال ثنا عبد الوهاب الثقفي قال ثنا أيوب عن أبي قلابة عن أنس عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ثلث من كن فيه وجد حلاوة الإيمان أن يكون الله ورسوله أحب إليه مما سواهما وأن يحب المرء لا يحبه إلا لله وأن يكره أن يعود في الكفر كما يكره أن يقذف في النار

The fruits of love for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) are now described here. Belief is compared to a sweet thing, and only those persons enjoy this sweet thing who are not corrupted and whose hearts are free from immoral acts and undesirable views. Just as a healthy person only enjoys sumptuous dinner so a man of neat and clean character enjoys the sweetness of Divine love. A sickly man with poor constitution cannot do justice to what he eats, similarly a man of bad character can not find any taste in Divine love.

ثلث من كن فيه وجد حلاوة الإيمان

Three things are prerequisites for appreciating the sweetness of belief. Now what is the meaning of sweetness here ? Commentators of Aḥādīth generally say that it is spiritual sweetness, because belief is not a material thing. Nawawī says that spiritual sweetness means happiness which one feels in following the teaching of Allāh and His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). The Holy Qur'ān expresses the point as follows :

"But, nay, by thy Lord, they will not believe (in truth) until they make thee judge of what is in dispute between them and find within themselves no dislike of that which thou decidest, and submit with full submission". (Qur'ān 4:65)

فلا وربك لا يؤمنون حتى يحكموك فيما شجر بينهم ثم لا يجدوا في أنفسهم حرجا مما قضيت ويسلموا تسليما۔ نسا آیت ۶۵

Maulānā Gangūhī wrote a letter to his teacher Ḥajī Shaykh Imdādullāh Makkī, in which he said: "By the grace of Allāh I have obtained three things : viz (i) More than two hundred students coming from various places have read *Ḥadīth* with me and are now engaged in teaching that subject in their own institutions ; (ii) Religious injunctions have now become as dear to me as natural things, and hence I feel dejected and uneasy in ignoring religious practices just as a hungry and thirsty person does. I am now inclined to religious matters in the same way as a man is inclined to food and water at the time of hunger and thirst ; and (iii) Those who praise me and those who condemn me appear to be equal in my view." The second point of Maulānā Gangūhī's letter is similar to what Imām Nawawī has said in his explanation of sweetness of belief:

Some people have meant by sweetness of belief perfection in belief and sincerity in discharge of religious duties. Shaykh Ibn Abī Jamrah has ascribed this view to jurisprudents in Muslim Law. Some Sūfīs maintain that sweetness of belief may be temporal also, not spiritual in all cases. The famous Sūfī and Muḥaddith Shaykh Ibn Abī Jamrah has supported this view in his commentary of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, entitled "Bahjat al-Nufūs" (Volume I pages 25 to 28). (He also said that only that person can appreciate the sweetness of belief who sincerely believes in Allāh and His Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).) A poet has beautifully expressed this point in the following words :

اِذَا لَمْ تَرَ الْهِلَالَ فَسَلِّمْ لِأُنَاسٍ رَأَوْهُ بِالْأَبْصَارِ

If you do not see the moon accept the statement of those who have seen it.

Sweetness of Belief and nearness to Allah and Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم)

The basic principle underlying sweetness of belief is profound love for Allāh, the Most Exalted, and after that sincere love for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), because he is the incarnation of all attributes and qualities of the Divine Being.

We are nearer to him than his jugular vein. (Qur'ān 50:16)

نَحْنُ أَقْرَبُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ حَبْلِ الْوَرِيدِ. ق آیت ١٦

God says to his believers on other occasion about His nearness.

"And We are nearer unto him than ye are, but ye see not" (Qur'ān 56:85)

وَنَحْنُ أَقْرَبُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْكُمْ وَلٰكِنْ
لَا تُبْصِرُونَ۔ (واقعہ آیت ٨٥)

Meaning of nearness to Allah

Nearness to Allāh is not the same as nearness to the thing of this world. It has a particular significance. Maulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Sāḥib has elaborated this point by citing an example of sunshine which has heat as well as light. Supposing that sunshine meditates in order to discover its own origin, it will first come across the sun of which it is part. After understanding the existence of the sun, it can understand its own origin. It shows that the sun being the real source of sunshine is closer to it than itself. It is obvious that the thing which comes first in course of movement is closer than the thing which comes later. For example, the different stations in course of journey are nearer to the traveller than the destination which is reached at the end. In other words the cause of a thing must be understood first, and the effect afterwards. Consequently, if we are to understand our existence we must first understand our Creator who is the Cause of us all. Our existence is only a shadow or reflection of the existence of Allāh, and hence He is closer to us than ourselves. The Qur'ān says :

The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their selves. (Qur'ān 33:6)

اَلنَّبِیُّ اَوْلٰی (اَیْ اَقْرَبُ) بِالْمُؤْمِنِیْنَ
مِنْ اَنْفُسِهِمْ (احزاب، آیت ٦)

Thus if a Muslim meditates and ponders in order to know his own self, he must first try to understand the existence and position of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). So the Qur'ān says that the Apostle is closer to the Believers than themselves, (the word "Aulā" used in the above verse means nearer and closer). Hence the Holy Prophet's existence is more important than our own existence. The source of all kinds of love (حب طبعی, حب احسانی, حب کمالی and حب جمالی is the Divine Being and after Him the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم).

Explanation of مما سوا هما "Things other than the two, i.e., Allāh and His Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم)"

The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) has put together Allāh and His Prophet under one "ضمیر" "pronoun" in this *Ḥadīth*, but on one occasion when a certain "خطیب" "preacher" combined Allāh and His Prophet in one sentence and said "Whoever disobeyed them (Allāh and His Prophet) went astray", the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) referring to him said "very bad preacher you are". Hence there seems to be some contradiction in these two *Aḥādīth*. Several doctors of Islamic learning have explained away this apparent contradiction in different ways, as under :

(i) Some of them say that the *Ḥadīth* containing "مما سوا هما" was of later date than the other *Ḥadīth*. In the beginning the Muslims did not fully appreciate the significance of Islamic teachings and the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was very particular in pointing out even small errors that were committed by Believers. When the Muslims became well-versed in principles of Islam and the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) realised that the Believers knew full well the difference between Allāh (the Almighty and Creator of the universe) and Ḥadrat Muḥammad (slave and Prophet of Allāh), he did not mind combining the two by using one pronoun for them.

(ii) Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar differentiates between a *Khuṭbah* (sermon) and other speeches and says that the preacher under reference was delivering a detailed sermon and he could easily refer to Allāh and His Prophet separately, whereas the other *Ḥadīth* was a kind of usual advice given in brevity. So the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) used one pronoun for Allāh and himself. It may be added here that *Khuṭbah* on the occasion of marriage is generally brief and is different from the *Khuṭbāhs* delivered on other occasions. Hence the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) combined Allāh and His Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) by using one pronoun in his *Khuṭbah* on marriage. So there is no contradiction between the two.

(iii) Some scholars of Islam say that the apparent contradiction in *Aḥādīth* can be removed by maintaining that what the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said was his special prerogative, and it is not permissible for other people to do the same.

(iv) The best explanation is that the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) combined Allāh and His Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) under one pronoun as a token of love, and love for the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is inherent in love for Allāh. Only that love for Allāh is taken into account when it is accompanied by love for the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) also.

Similarly, love for the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is beneficial only when it is supported by love for Allāh. If any one says that he loves the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) and ignores Allāh, he is an infidel, pure and simple. Similarly, if any person claims that he loves Allāh but does not believe in the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) he is surely a disbeliever. The Holy Qur'ān says :

Say, (O Muḥammad, to mankind): If ye love Allāh, follow me; Allāh will love you. (Qur'ān, 3:31)

قُلْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُحِبُّونَ اللّٰهَ فَاتَّبِعُونِي يُحْبِبْكُمُ اللّٰهُ۔ (آلِ عمران آیت ۳۱)

Loveliness of the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم)

The Holy Qur'ān has referred to Prophet Moses (علیه السلام) in various places in appreciative terms and made mention of Allāh's love for him also as the following verse indicates :

And I endued thee (O Moses) with love from Me that thou mightest be trained according to My Will. (Qur'ān, 20:39)

وَأَلْقَيْتُ عَلَيْكَ مَحَبَّةً مِّنِّي وَلِتُصْنَعَ عَلَىٰ عَيْنِي۔ (طٰہٰ، آیت ۳۹)

Anyhow when I ponder over the previous verse (3:31) I cannot but feel ecstasy and special pleasure. Allāh, the Most Exalted, addressing the Believers, says that if they claim to love Allāh they must first follow His Prophet, and if they follow the Prophet, Allāh will love them and forgive their sins. Thus Believers will become objects of love for Allāh and Prophet.

In short, love for Allāh and love for His Messenger (صلی الله علیه وسلم) are interwoven, and one cannot be separated from the other. In order to emphasise this point the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) has mentioned Allāh and Prophet together by using one pronoun of dual form. The pronoun in "ومن يعصهما" "see above" signifies that disobedience either to Allāh or Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) constitutes enough ground for rendering one, an infidel or sinful. The Qur'ān says :

Obey Allāh, and obey the Messenger and those of you who are in authority. (Qur'ān, 4:59)

أَطِيعُوا اللّٰهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ (النساء، آیت ۵۹)

The word "اطیعوا" i.e. "obey" has been used for Allāh and again for His Messenger, but not for "اولی الامر منکم" i.e. "those who are in authority". The reason is that obedience to the people of authority is not a permanent affair as is obedience to Allāh and His Messenger (صلی الله علیه وسلم). If a person obeys Allāh and disobeys the Prophet, he will not be a Believer. Hence the Messenger of Allāh took exception to the aforesaid preachers' combination of Allāh and Prophet under one pronoun, and directed him to mention the two separately and use one "حرف عطف" "conjunction" between the two.

Ṭaḥāwī writes in his book "*Mushkil al-Āthār*" that the Holy Prophet's objection to the preacher's phrase "من يعصهما" is that the latter did not stop when he used previously the phrase "فقد رشد" i.e., "he is in the straight-path". He combined both together, and thereby the whole expression became meaningless. Nay, it amounted to infidelity, pure and simple. The interpretation of Ṭaḥāwī seems to be reasonable, but there is no proof that the *Khaṭīb* (preacher) did not stop actually between the two parts of the sentence. Again, Ibn Abil Dunyā says in course of his narration of the *Ḥadīth* that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) took exception to *Khaṭīb's* expression and addressed him, "Say, and whoever disobeys Allāh and His Messenger is misguided". The way in which the

Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) corrected the *Khaṭīb's* expression and used the two parts of it separately indicates that the cause of the Prophet's objection to the *Khaṭīb's* sentence was his combination of the two under one pronoun and Allāh knows the best.

Refinement of expression

In my opinion the above-mentioned point may be explained in another way, which is based on Imām Ghazālī's statement, i.e., the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) taught his followers to use a polished language in course of their conversations with one another, in addition to teaching them principles of Islam. On one occasion the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said :

لَا تُسَمُّوا الْعِنَبَ كَرَمًا فَإِنَّمَا الْكَرَمُ
الرَّجُلُ الْمُسْلِمُ

Do not call grapes "Karam", because Karam (meaning generosity) is a quality of a Muslim.

Similarly, the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) forbade the people to call evening meal as *'Atmah* because it was used by Bedouin Arabs. A certain person once told the Apostle (صلی الله علیه وسلم) "If Allāh wishes and you wish", he got angry and said "Have you made me partner of Allāh? Say only "If Allāh wishes". Other examples may be cited here : The Holy Qur'ān says :

لَا تَقُوْلُوْا رَاعِنَا وَقُوْلُوا انْظُرْنَا (بقرہ آیت ۱۰۴)

Say not (unto the Prophet): "Listen to us" but say "Look upon us."
(Qur'ān 2:104)

The Muslims formerly used the word "Rā'inā" to call the Holy Prophet's attention, but the Jews changed it into insult by pronouncing it as Rā'eenā (meaning our shepherd). Though the Prophet's Companions were his reliable and sincere followers, Allāh directed them to use a better expression in order to avoid misunderstanding. The Muslims were taught etiquette and manners by Allāh and His Messenger in every day's business including conversation. In this way full justice was done to all persons taking part in conversation. Ḥudhayfah bin al-Yamān has narrated the following *Ḥadīth* :

قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لَا يَقُلْ
أَحَدُكُمْ مَا شَاءَ اللّٰهُ وَشِئْتَ وَلٰكِنْ يَقُلْ مَا
شَاءَ اللّٰهُ ثُمَّ شِئْتَ۔

The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said :

None of us should say "If Allāh wishes and you wish. He may say, "If Allāh wishes and afterward you wish".

In this way even the remotest possibility of polytheism or partnership in Godhead is removed from the Muslims' minds once and for all.

The second thing, necessary for appreciating وَأَنْ يُحِبَّ الْمَرْءَ لَا يُحِبُّهُ إِلَّا لِلّٰهِ and enjoying the sweetness of Belief is that if a man loves anyone he loves him only for the sake of Allāh. The chief object of love is the Divine Being, and after Him His Messenger, and, as a result, all those persons who love Allāh and His Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) become objects of love and affection for all Muslims. To call sexual or ignoble passions as love is really a misnomer. Such kinds of evil desires are only a means of mutual jealousy and corruption. When no sexual or ignoble passions are involevd, it is love, pure and simple.

The third thing essential for appreciating أَنْ يَعُوْدَ فِي الْكُفْرِ كَمَا يَكْرَهُ أَنْ يُقْذَفَ فِي النَّارِ the sweetness of Belief is that one must hate to become an infidel again just as one hates to be thrown into fire. The word 'Aud' means to go back. As many early Muslims were formerly infidels and polytheists, the word was purposely used. At present this word means simply to become, because an overwhelming majority of Muslims are heriditary Muslims. The expression "لتعودن في ملتنا" (i.e. you come back to our religion) is used in the Holy Qur'ān about Prophets of Allāh, though they were free from infidelity and polytheism from their infancy.

CHAPTER X

THE SIGN OF BELIEF IS LOVE OF THE ANṢĀR

16. We have been told by Abul Walīd who said that he was informed by Shu'bah who said : 'Abdullāh bin Abdullāh bin Jabr told us that he heard Anas bin Mālik say :

✱ The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alihi wa sallam*) said : "The sign of Faith is one's love for the Anṣār (helpers) and the sign of hypocrisy is one's hatred for the Anṣār."

بَابٌ 10 عَلَامَةُ الْإِيْمَانِ حُبُّ الْأَنْصَارِ

16- حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْوَلِيْدِ قَالَ ثَنَا شُعْبَةُ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنِيْ عَبْدُ اللهِ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ جَبْرٍ قَالَ سَمِعْتُ أَنَسَ بْنَ مَالِكٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ آيَةُ الْإِيْمَانِ حُبُّ الْأَنْصَارِ وَآيَةُ النِّفَاقِ بُغْضُ الْأَنْصَارِ

Imām Bukhārī first mentioned love in general terms—love which any person can have for the Almighty. Now love for Anṣār is described. According to the aforesaid *Ḥadīth*, the sign of Faith is love for the Anṣār, who first embraced Islām in groups and then invited the Messenger of Allāh and his followers to Madīnah and when they migrated to that place, they (Anṣār) sacrificed everything for Islam and provided all kinds of facilities for the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and his followers. Further, the Messenger of Allāh says that if a person dislikes or hates the Anṣār, he is certainly a hypocrite. It must be noted here that love for Anṣār as helpers of the Faith is a sign of Faith. Similarly malice for Anṣār as helpers of the Faith is a sign of hypocrisy.

Disputes among Companions about fighting against infidels

Disputes among the Prophet's Companions were based on difference of opinions and views only. The Anṣār usually supported Allāh's Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the members of the Prophet's family generally sided with Ḥaḍrat 'Alī (رضى الله عنه). Now the question is : Why did Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah, (رضى الله عنه), Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah (رضى الله عنها) and several prominent Companions fight with Ḥaḍrat 'Alī (رضى الله عنه) ? The answer is that this fighting was due to difference of opinion or error of judgement. Otherwise they had held one another in esteem and affection. They had no personal grudge or malice for one another. They fought in the way as two brothers fight, or quarrelled in the way as father and son some time do. This does not indicate that the Companions had hostility towards one another.

Allāh the most Exalted says :

"And We remove whatever rancour may be in their hearts" (Qur'an 7:43)

وَنَزَعْنَا مَا فِيْ صُدُوْرِهِمْ مِّنْ غِلٍّ (اعراف آيت ۴۳)

Before the Companions' entry in the Paradise Allāh will be pleased to remove whatever rancour might be in their hearts. Ḥaḍrat 'Alī (رضى الله عنه) said that according to the above verse of the Qur'ān all disputes between him and Ḥaḍrat Ṭalḥah and Ḥaḍrat Zubayr (رضى الله عنهما) were removed in this world and they would be reclining on couches face to face in the Hereafter. Similarly all those Aḥādīth, which say that love for Ḥaḍrat 'Alī and members of the Prophet's family is a sign of Faith and malice for them is an indication of hypocrisy, signify that love or hatred for their personality as such is intended, whereas disputes between Ḥaḍrat 'Alī and Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah were the results of difference of opinion only. They had no personal grudge against each other. It is recorded in history that during the war between Ḥaḍrat 'Alī and Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah the Roman emperor wrote a letter to the latter saying. "I am informed that 'Alī is oppressing you. If you desire, I may send troops to help you". Ḥaḍrat Mu'awiyah retorted in fury, saying, "You Christian-dog!" you now contemplate to invade Madīnah, destroy our religion and oppress the Muslims. Bear in mind that if you take any step against the Muslims or attack Madīnah, the first soldier who will fight for Ḥaḍrat 'Alī will be Mu'āwiyah". This fact proves beyond doubt that there was political difference only between the two, and in respect of religion they held the same view and respected each other.

If we study the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth* minutely we come to the conclusion that *Ḥadīth* is really an explanation or commentary of what is said in the Qur'ān. Maulānā Syed Anwar Shāh says that the source of the aforesaid *Ḥadīth* is the following verse of the Qur'ān :

"Those who entered the city and the Faith before them love those who flee unto them for refuge" (Qur'ān 59:9)

وَالَّذِيْنَ تَبَوَّؤُ الدَّارَ وَالْإِيْمَانَ مِنْ
قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّوْنَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ (الحشر آيت ۹)

This verse refers to Madīnah as home. Its inhabitants (Anṣār) who had embraced Islam already received the Muslims of Makkah (Muhājirs) cordially and extended wholehearted hospitality to them in the name of Allāh and His Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم). In the verse of the Qur'ān Faith has been compared to a house because a house affords protection to its occupants from trouble and Faith protects us against infidelity and sin. The Anṣār of Madīnah were the most staunch supporters of Islam and hence love for them is a sign of Faith and hostility towards them is a sign of hypocrisy.

CHAPTER XI

بابٌ 11

17. We have been told by Abū al-Yamān who said that Shu'ayb told him via Zuhrī : Abū Idrīs 'Ā'idhullāh bin 'Abdullāh said that 'Ubādah bin Ṣāmit, who had participated in the Battle of Badr, and who was one of the guards (Naqīb) on the nights of 'Aqabah, narrated :

✢ The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said to a group of Companions who surrounded him. "Take an oath of allegiance to me that you will ascribe nothing a partner unto Allāh and neither steal nor commit adultery nor kill your children nor produce any lie that you have desvised between your hands and feet nor disobey in what is right Whoever of you fulfils these conditions will be rewarded by Allāh, and whoever commits a sin and is afflicted in this world will have it as an expiation (Kaffārah) for his sin. Whoever does an evil deed and Allāh conceals it then it is for Allāh to forgive him if He so desires or punishes him if He so wills." (The narrator of *Ḥadith* says) : We then took an oath of allegiance to the Holy Prophet (*ṣallāllaho 'alaihi wa sallam*) accordingly.

17- حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْيَمَانِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا شُعَيْبٌ عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ قَالَ أَنَا أَبُو إِدْرِيْسَ عَائِذُ اللهِ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللهِ أَنَّ عُبَادَةَ بْنَ الصَّامِتِ وَكَانَ شَهِدَ بَدْرًا وَّهُوَ أَحَدُ النُّقَبَاءِ لَيْلَةَ الْعَقَبَةِ أَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ وَحَوْلَهُ عِصَابَةٌ مِّنْ أَصْحَابِهِ بَايِعُوْنِيْ عَلَى أَنْ لَّا تُشْرِكُوْا بِاللهِ شَيْئًا وَّلَا تَسْرِقُوْا وَلَا تَزْنُوْا وَلَا تَقْتُلُوْا أَوْلَادَكُمْ وَلَا تَأْتُوْا بِبُهْتَانٍ تَفْتَرُوْنَهُ بَيْنَ أَيْدِيْكُمْ وَأَرْجُلِكُمْ وَلَا تَعْصُوْا فِيْ مَعْرُوْفٍ فَمَنْ وَّفٰى مِنْكُمْ فَأَجْرُهُ عَلَى اللهِ وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذٰلِكَ شَيْئًا فَعُوْقِبَ فِي الدُّنْيَا فَهُوَ كَفَّارَةٌ لَّهُ وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذٰلِكَ شَيْئًا ثُمَّ سَتَرَهُ اللهُ فَهُوَ إِلَى اللهِ إِنْ شَاءَ عَفَا عَنْهُ وَإِنْ شَاءَ عَاقَبَهُ فَبَايَعْنَاهُ عَلَى ذٰلِكَ ؛

Sometimes Imām Bukhārī names Bāb (chapter) but does not mention the subject matter thereof. Sometimes he relates the subject matter but does not narrate any *Ḥadīth*. This is the first occasion when Bukhārī has named chapter without subject matter. Some commentators of *Ḥadīth* say that in such cases Bukhārī means to say that the new chapter does not contain any new problem, it only completes what was related on the previous chapter. The great scholar, Shaykh al-Hind supports this view and adds that sometimes Imām Bukhārī intentionally omits to mention the subject matter of a chapter in order to test the intelligence of readers. It may be noted that in some editions of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* even the *Bāb* (chapter) is not written. Some scholars of *Ḥadīth* are of the opinion that Bukhārī intended to mention the subject matter under every chapter, but his death stood in the way. Some commentators say that the ascriber who copied *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* omitted to mention the same. But this view is not appealing, as the whole book was completed and its several copies of the same were prepared during the Imām's life-time. It is also said that Imām Bukhārī generally wrote *Aḥādīth* on one side of paper and noted subject matters on the other. In some cases, however, he omitted to mention the subject matter due to oversight. This sort of explanation is not worthy of consideration.

If this chapter is really a continuation or completion of the previous chapter, then it may be said that in the previous chapter it was related that love for *Anṣār* is a sign of Faith and in this chapter the reason for naming the *Anṣār* as such is mentioned in some detail.

The title of Badrī (i. e. one who participated in the first Islamic war of Badr) proves that the people of Madīnah staked life, money and everything in the service of Allāh and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم); and the word *Naqīb* (a guard) also indicates that the Bay'at of the people of Madīnah in 'Aqabah (valley) at Makkah was an oath of allegiance which they took to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and which they observed heart and soul as long as they lived. Furthermore, the word *Anṣār*, plural of Nāṣir, means helpers. As the inhabitants of Madīnah extended all kinds of assistance and support to the Prophet of Islam and the Muslims who migrated to Madīnah, they were given the title of Anṣār by Allāh and His Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

The above-quoted *Ḥadīth* is preceded by refutation of the views of the Murjites (a sect of early Muslims who held that man is absolutely helpless and cannot act freely and who also maintained that sins and crimes cannot affect Faith). Now this *Ḥadīth* refutes the principles of the Mutazilites (who believed that man has got freedom of will and can act in the way he likes) and of Khawarijites (who did not believe in *Aḥādīth*. In this way the extreme views regarding man's freedom of will are eliminated and a moderate view of the people of "Sunnat wal Jamā'at is endorsed. Man's actions are not parts of Faith in the sense that the absence of the former means negation of the latter. The expressions in the aforesaid *Ḥadīth* "It will be *Kaffārah* (expiation) for him" and "He will forgive him if He so desires" clearly prove this view, because *Kaffārah* (expiation) and forgiveness are not meant for those who cease to be Believers. *Al-Nuqabā* is plural of *Naqīb* literally means one who guards. During the time when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) lived at Makkah, some people of Madīnah met him and embraced Islam. They took an oath of allegiance to him at night privately in 'Aqabah to avoid resentment and oppression of the Quraysh who were disbelievers. This happened in the early period of Islam and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

had not yet migrated to Madīnah. *'Iṣābah*, meaning a group, is generally used for 10 to 40 persons. This indicates that the people of Madīnah who took an oath of allegiance to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) at Makkah were small in number as compared to the number of those present on the occasion of Ḥudaybiyah on the fall of Makkah.

The meaning of Bay'at

The religious meaning of "بيعت" (Bay'at) is to swear allegiance to the Head of Islamic religion and carry out all his commands issued in the name of religion. As the object of Bay'at is achieved through the Prophet or his Deputy, the Qur'ān says :

> Lo! those who swear allegiance unto thee (Muḥammad), swear allegiance only unto Allāh. The Hand of Allāh is above their hands. (Qur'ān 48:10)

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يُبَايِعُونَكَ إِنَّمَا يُبَايِعُونَ اللهَ
يَدُ اللهِ فَوْقَ أَيْدِيهِمْ ۔ الفتح آيت ١٠

Swearing allegiance to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is really swearing allegiance to Allāh Himself, because the former acts on behalf of the latter. As mentioned in *Aḥādīth*, the Muslims took an oath of allegiance to the Apostle on several occasions and gave him an undertaking that they would participate in *Jihād* (Holy war) wholeheartedly, they would observe the five principles of Islam sincerely, give up all evil deeds, migrate to Madīnah when ordered and so on. On the occasion of the "Treaty of Ḥudaybiyah" the Believers had to give a solemn assurance that in no case would they run away from the battlefield. From the Anṣār of Madīnah the Prophet obtained a vow that they would always speak the truth without fear or favour. In Ṣaḥīh Bukhārī it is mentioned that the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) took an oath of allegiance from Ḥaḍrat Jarīr to the effect that he would remain a true well-wisher of every Muslim.

The Bay'at at the hands of sūfīs may also be regarded as a true copy of the above-mentioned Bay'at if they honestly follow in the footsteps of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and have similar objects in view. If Mashā'ikh are Deputies of Allāh and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in the true sense of the term, Bay'at with them will be justified according to the religion of Islam, otherwise certainly not. It is neither advisable nor desirable to become a *Murīd* (follower) of a so-called *ṣūfī* who runs after money or fame only and seldom cares for the teachings of Islam. The history of early *ṣūfīs* and *walīs* proves beyond doubt that they tried their best to keep intact the purity and dignity of Islam and protect it against all kinds of greed and inducements.

The narrator of the event of Bay'at (stated above) is Ḥaḍrat 'Ubādah bin Ṣāmit who is distinguished on two accounts, viz (i) He took part in the battle of Badr and for the people of Badr Allāh has announced forgiveness; and (ii) he was one of *Naqībs* (guards), of Madīnah who met the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in 'Aqabah at Makkah and took an oath of allegiance to him.

عَلَىٰ أَنْ لَّا تُشْرِكُوا بِاللهِ شَيْئًا

'Ubādah bin Ṣāmit says that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) accepted the allegiance of the people of Madīnah, who met him at Makkah on the following terms: (i) They will not make anything partner of Allāh, either in His Essence or His attributes. (ii) They will neither steal nor commit adultery (iii). They will not kill their children. It may be noted here that in pre-Islamic Arabia some people used to kill their children either on account of extreme poverty or, in case of female children, they regarded it below their dignity to marry their daughters or they feared a fall to poverty. The Holy Qur'ān says :

And that ye slay not your children because of penury. We provide for you and for them. (Qur'an 6:152)

وَلَا تَقْتُلُوْٓا اَوْلَادَكُمْ مِّنْ اِمْلَاقٍ نَحْنُ نَرْزُقُكُمْ وَاِيَّاهُمْ (انعام آیت ۱۵۲)

And slay not your children, fearing a fall to poverty. We shall provide for them and for you (Qur'ān 17:31)

وَلَا تَقْتُلُوْٓا اَوْلَادَكُمْ خَشْيَةَ اِمْلَاقٍ نَحْنُ نَرْزُقُهُمْ وَاِيَّاكُمْ (بنی اسرائیل آیت ۳۱)

A significant point in the *āyāt* about slaying children

There is some fine point of difference in the two verses, though both convey the similar idea, namely, in the first verse the word "خشیه" (fear) is not used and "املاق" (penury) only is used and the pronoun of the second person (کم) precedes the pronoun of the third person "هم". But in the second verse the word "خشیه" (fear) is mentioned and the order of the two said pronouns is changed. The reason for this difference is that the first verse refers to the first named cause of slaying children, and the second verse relates to the last cause of killing children. Again, the first verse indicates that in cases of existing poverty the people thought first about their own needs and afterwards about those of their children, whereas the second verse refers to the apprehended poverty, hence the people considered more about the requirements of their children than their own. By assuring full provision to the people and their children, Allāh, the Exalted, has eliminated the inhuman practice of the slaying of children.

A significant point in the Qur'an about Ramadan

The following verses of the Holy Qur'ān about fasting in Ramaḍān convey the same meaning, but some fine difference ;

Fasting is prescribed for you, even as it was prescribed for those before you, that ye may ward off (evil) ; (Fast) a certain number of days; and (for) him who is sick among you, or on a journey, (the same number of other days,) (Qur'ān 2:183-184)

كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الصِّيَامُ كَمَا كُتِبَ عَلَى الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُوْنَ اَيَّامًا مَّعْدُوْدَاتٍ فَمَنْ كَانَ مِنْكُمْ مَّرِيْضًا اَوْ عَلٰى سَفَرٍ الخ

And whosoever of you is present, let him fast the month, and whosoever of you, is sick or on a journey, (let him fast the same) number of other days. (Qur'ān 2:185)

فَمَنْ شَهِدَ مِنْكُمُ الشَّهْرَ فَلْيَصُمْهُ وَمَنْ كَانَ مَرِيْضًا اَوْ عَلٰى سَفَرٍ فَعِدَّةٌ مِّنْ اَيَّامٍ اُخَرَ (بقرہ، آیت ۱۸۵)

In the first verse the word "منکم" (i.e. of you) is used, but not in the second verse. The reason is that ransom "فدیه" in case of illness or journey was permitted for the Muslims only, and not for other peoples. Hence the meaning of the first verse is that though fasting was prescribed for other peoples also, the concession of ransom was allowed for the Muslims only. Afterwards there was no need of using "منکم" (of you) in the second verse.

"And you will produce no lie وَلَا تَأْتُوْا بِبُهْتَانٍ تَفْتَرُوْنَهٗ بَيْنَ اَيْدِيْكُمْ وَاَرْجُلِكُمْ which you have devised between your hands and your feet." The idea is that the Believers must not manufacture lies or distort facts in any way. Here the hands and feet refer to human brain which fabricates lies sometimes in order to entangle innocent persons. Some scholars say that this expression relates to a woman who, after begetting children through adultery, ascribes them to her husband.

وَلَا تَعْصُوْا فِيْ مَعْرُوْفٍ

"And you do not disobey in what is right." In this verse a general instruction is given to the Muslims that they must always follow the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) in all cases without any hesitation.

Every sensible thing the excellence of which is accepted by reason and nature and which is recognised by religion is called "معروف" "Ma'rūf" i.e. (what is right). The condition of "Ma'rūf" is mentioned in that allegiance which the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) took from women viz "ولا يعصينك في معروف" (and they will not disobey you in what is right.)

Now the question is why the word "معروف" (i.e., what is right) is mentioned here when the fact is that all the instructions of the Prophet are right definitely and positively.

The answer is that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was innocent and never said or did any thing which was not right, but his Caliphs or deputies were (or are) not innocent. It was (and is) possible for them to make mistakes. This condition of "Ma'rūf" here is similar to what is said by Allāh to His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), in the following verse of the Qur'ān :

If thou ascribe a partner to Allāh, thy work will fail." (Qur'ān 39:65)

لَئِنْ أَشْرَكْتَ لَيَحْبَطَنَّ عَمَلُكَ۔ الزمر آيت ٦٥

The condition aims at emphasizing the matter. For this reason the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, "One must not obey in what is sin near the Creator."

i.e., "Whosoever fulfils the terms of allegiance فَمَنْ وَفَى مِنْكُمْ فَأَجْرُهُ عَلَى اللهِ will be rewarded by Allāh, i.e. it is an assurance of Allāh that He would confer favours on those Believers who faithfully observe the terms of Allegiance."

i.e. "If a person commits any وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذٰلِكَ شَيْئًا فَعُوقِبَ فِي الدُّنْيَا فَهُوَ كَفَّارَةٌ لَهُ wrong deed and is punished in this world, this will be an expiation (*Kaffārah*) for him."

The question to be considered in this connection is whether a guilty person, after being duly punished according to Muslim law and after making heartfelt *Taubah* (repentance) for his sins will be totally free from the effects of his misdeeds or not. The scholars of the Ḥanafī and Shāfi'ī schools agree that as a result of punishment, in this world to be followed by sincere *Taubah*, a sinful person will be free from the consequences of his past misdeeds. There is difference of opinion in case of punishments which are not followed by *Taubah*. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah holds that punishments are only corrective and preventive and not substitutes for *Taubah*. Without *Taubah* a sinful person cannot get salvation in the Hereafter.

Taubah (repentance) is essential for avoiding punishment in the Hereafter. The Shāfi'ī scholars maintain that when a guilty person has been duly punished in the world for his crimes, he will be safe from penance in the next world, whether he makes repentance or not. Imām Bukhārī endorses this view; and in support of it he refers to the expression (It will be an expiation from him) in the above-quoted *Ḥadīth*. The Imām also cites the following verse of the Qur'ān:

(And whoso hath not the wherewithal must) fast two consecutive months. A penance from Allāh. (Qur'ān, 4:92)

فَصِيَامُ شَهْرَيْنِ مُتَتَابِعَيْنِ تَوْبَةً مِنَ اللهِ (نساء ٩٢)

It clearly states that after punishment in this world the guilty person will be secured from penance in the Hereafter. The Shāfi'īs also refer to the following *Ḥadīth*: 'ومن اصاب من ذالک شيئا ثم ستره الله ان شاء عفا عنه وان شاء عاقبه' "Whoever does an evil deed and Allāh conceals it, then Allāh may forgive him if He so desires or punishes him if He so wills."

In other words, if Allāh conceals any man's sin here, it is for Him to punish him in the Hereafter or forgive him. Hence it is more likely that a person after having been properly punished here will be free from penance in the Hereafter.

Ḥākim has narrated the following *Ḥadīth* from Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah in his book *al-Mustadrak* through a reliable chain of transmission:

I do not know whether Ḥudūd (prescribed punishments) may be expiation or not.

لَا اَدْرِیْ هَلِ الْحُدُوْدُ كَفَّارَةٌ اَمْ لَا

Contradiction in *Aḥādīth*

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has tried to remove contradiction between this *Ḥadīth* and the *Ḥadīth* mentioned in the beginning of this chapter by saying: Abū Hurayrah's *Ḥadīth* relates to the time when the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) himself did not know whether Ḥudūd (prescribed punishments) were expiation *Kaffārah* or not. When he was endowed with knowledge on the subject he said that Ḥudūd are expiation. 'Allāmah 'Aynī has rejected the view of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar by saying that the *Ḥadīth* in the beginning of the chapter describes the event of Bay'at of 'Aqabah which took place before *Hijrat*, whereas Abū Hurayrah accepted Islam and came to Madīnah in 7 A.H. It may be said that Abū Hurayrah did not hear this *Ḥadīth* direct from the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) but through some other narrator. But this is not correct because Abū Hurayrah has clearly stated that he heard the *Ḥadīth* direct from the Messenger of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar also says that the Bay'at of 'Aqabah is not referred to, in the *Ḥadīth* in question. It refers to that Bay'at which was taken by the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) soon after the conquest of Makkah. Thus Abū Hurayrah's *Ḥadīth* is dated later than the other *Ḥadīth*, and hence the contradiction between two *Aḥādīth* is removed. It may be noted that Ḥaḍrat 'Ubādah bin Ṣāmit is mentioned here as a Badrī (one who took part in the battle of Badr) by way of his eminence and importance among the Companions of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

Though the word of *'Iṣābah* generally means a group of persons not exceeding forty, sometimes, it indicates hundreds of people also. The Messenger of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) described 313 participants of the battle of Badr as 'Iṣābah. Again, if Bay'at in the *Ḥadīth* refers to the Bay'at taken soon after the conquest of Makkah, it would mean that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) took oath of allegiance from the people of Makkah in several batches one after another.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has sought to prove his case (viz. the said Bay'at took place after conquest of Makkah by saying that the terms of Bay'at have been taken from the following verse of the Qur'ān :

O Prophet! if believing women come unto thee, taking oath of allegiance unto thee that they will ascribe nothing as partner unto Allāh, and will neither steal nor commit adultery, nor kill their children, nor produce any lie that they have devised between their hands and feet, nor disobey thee in what is right, then accept their allegiance and ask Allāh to forgive them. Lo! Allāh is Forgiving, Merciful.

(Qur'ān, 60:12)

يٰٓاَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ اِذَا جَآءَكَ الْمُؤْمِنٰتُ يُبَايِعْنَكَ
عَلٰٓى اَنْ لَّا يُشْرِكْنَ بِاللّٰهِ شَيْـًٔا وَّلَا يَسْرِقْنَ وَلَا يَزْنِيْنَ
وَلَا يَقْتُلْنَ اَوْلَادَهُنَّ وَلَا يَاْتِيْنَ بِبُهْتَانٍ يَّفْتَرِيْنَهٗ
بَيْنَ اَيْدِيْهِنَّ وَاَرْجُلِهِنَّ وَلَا يَعْصِيْنَكَ فِيْ مَعْرُوْفٍ
فَبَايِعْهُنَّ وَاسْتَغْفِرْ لَهُنَّ اللّٰهَ ؕ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ غَفُوْرٌ
رَّحِيْمٌ ۝ (الممتحنة آيت ۱۲)

It is admitted on all hands that the *sūrah* of *al-Mumtaḥinah* was revealed after the Treaty of Ḥudaybīyah which took place after Bay'at of 'Aqabah. Some scholars, however, say that similarly the expression does not necessarily indicate that the *Ḥadīth* has been taken from the above-quoted, verse of the Qur'ān. It may be possible that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said something on an occasion and the Qur'ānic verse, was later revealed to endorse it. Not only the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), some of his Companions, such as, Ḥaḍrat 'Umar, said something and the Holy Qur'ān confirmed it later on.

In short, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar and 'Allāmah 'Aynī differ regarding the date of Bay'at mentioned in the beginning of the chapter. Qasṭalānī, on the authority of the well-known book of *Ḥadīth*, Nasā'ī", says that this Bay'at is Bay'at of 'Aqabah. Furthermore, 'Allāmah 'Aynī says that all kinds of calamities, earthly and heavenly, are included in the expression "punished in this world".

Ḥudūd (prescribed punishments for crimes) are also some kinds of calamities. Several *Aḥādīth* indicate that diseases and misfortunes lead to mitigation of the effects of sins. Even if a thorn pricks a Believer, some of his sins are written off. But none can say with certainty what kind of sins will be alleviated and what not. 'Allāmah 'Aynī in support of his theory says that Ḥudūd were not prescribed by the time of Bay'at of 'Aqabah. Ibn Sīrīn also says that Ḥudūd were not fixed by the time the incident of Banī 'Uraynah took place. According to 'Aynī Ḥudūd were prescribed for two crimes only among several crimes mentioned in the *Ḥadīth* under discussion.

Are *Ḥudūd Kaffārah* or not?

According to the established view of Ḥanafī scholars *Ḥudūd* (prescribed punishments) are a kind of menace and lesson but not Kaffārah (atonement). This opinion of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah is mentioned in *Durri Mukhtār* and other books of jurisprudence. Though it is not certain whether the three well-known founders of Ḥanafī school agree to this point or not.

A Munāẓarah (disputation) took place between the well-known Ḥanafī scholar Shaykh Abul Ḥasan Ṭaliqānī and the famous Shāfi'ī scholar Abū Ṭayyib Ṭabarī on the point "If *Kaffārah* for breaking an oath is given before an oath is actually broken, the same will be accepted or not. In course of discussion, the Shaykh said that *Kaffārah* is intended to cover sins, and it is so named because it literally means to conceal or hide. In support of his view he has narrated the following *Ḥadīth*.

And for this reason the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said; Ḥudūd are Kaffārah for those who commit sins. They are named Kaffārah because they are an atonement for sins and cover them.
(*Ṭabaqātul Shafi'īyah* vol. III p. 138)

وَلِذٰلِكَ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
اَلْحُدُوْدُ كَفَّارَاتٌ لِاَهْلِهَا وَاِنَّمَا سَمَّاهَا كَفَّارَةً
لِاَنَّهَا تُكَفِّرُ الذُّنُوْبَ وَتُغَطِّيْهَا (طبقات الشافعية ص ١٣٨ ج ٣)

In short, Shaykh Abul Ḥasan Ṭāliqānī's *Ḥadīth* may be based on the *Ḥadīth* narrated by 'Ubādah bin Ṣāmit, and this matter has been thoroughly discussed above.

Hanafis' first argument

Ḥanafīs maintain that Ḥudūd (prescribed punishments) are a kind of threat and lesson, as the following verse of the Qur'ān indicates :

As for the thief, both male and female, cut off their hands. It is the reward of their own deeds, and exemplary punishment from Allāh. Allāh is Mighty, Wise.
(Qur'ān 5:38)

وَالسَّارِقُ وَالسَّارِقَةُ فَاقْطَعُوْٓا اَيْدِيَهُمَا
جَزَآءًۢ بِمَا كَسَبَا نَكَالًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ ۗ وَاللّٰهُ عَزِيْزٌ حَكِيْمٌ ۝

The words "جزاء" (meaning reward) and "نكالا" (meaning exemplary punishment) are reasons for cutting hands of a thief. According to Arabic Grammar these words are either two objects "مفعول له" separately or the two are merged in one. Anyhow, the Qur'ānic verse means a thief's hands are cut off as a punishment of his theft. It may be noted that this is punishment for theft, and not compensation for the things stolen away. This punishment is preventive and corrective, and is a warning to the people against committing theft in future.

Imām Rāghib says that the fetter of the cattle and strap of iron are called "Nakāl", because they prevent the cattle from escape. The object of the Qur'ānic verse is to stop theft once for all.

Modern Critics of Islamic Hudud

The people of Western culture and modern views generally criticise Islamic Ḥudūd on the ground that the punishments are uncivilised. Such critics ought to realise that theft is a cruel and barbarous act, and for suppressing it some sort of harsh punishment is essential. Abul 'Ulā al-Ma'arrī (an atheist poet) says:

يَدٌ بِخَمْسِ مِئِينَ عَسْجَدٍ وُدِيَتْ   مَا بَالُهَا قُطِعَتْ فِي رُبْعِ دِينَارِ

Why the hand priced at 500 dīnārs (gold coins)
could be cut off for quarter of a dīnār.

تَحَكُّمٌ: مَا لَنَا إِلَّا السُّكُوتُ لَهُ   وَأَنْ نَعُوذَ بِمَوْلَانَا مِنَ النَّارِ

This is a Government order. We cannot but remain
silent, and we seek shelter of our Lord against fire.

Shaykh 'Ilmuddīn al Sakhāwī replies :

عِزُّ الْأَمَانَةِ أَغْلَاهَا وَأَرْخَصَهَا   ذُلُّ الْخِيَانَةِ، فَافْهَمْ حِكْمَةَ الْبَارِي

The Importance of Amānat (Trust) raised the price of the hand, but the
disgrace of treachery brought it down. Understand the wisdom of Allāh.

A certain poet has said :

هُنَاكَ مَظْلُومَةٌ غَالَتْ بِقِيمَتِهَا   وَهٰهُنَا ظَلَمَتْ هَانَتْ عَلَى الْبَارِي

When the hand was oppressed, its price was high. When
it oppressed (by means of treachery) it was disgraced near Allāh.

'Allāmah Shamsuddīn Kurdī is reported to have said :

قِيمَةُ الْيَدِ نِصْفُ الْأَلْفِ مِنْ ذَهَبٍ   فَإِنْ تَعَدَّتْ فَلَا تَسْوَى بِدِينَارِ

The price of the hand was 500 dīnārs. and when it
oppressed, its price became less than a dīnār.

Several others have also replied to treacherous Abul 'Ulā al-Ma'arrī in the same rhyme and metre. It has been beautifully expressed in prose as follows :

لَمَّا كَانَتْ أَمِينَةً كَانَتْ ثَمِينَةً لَمَّا
خَانَتْ هَانَتْ

When the hand was a trustee it was precious and when it committed treachery it was disgraced.

Allāh is 'Azīz i.e., He is Mighty and Powerful enough to protect His Creatures against all troubles. Allāh is also Wise and acts in the interest of justice and prudence. The above-quoted verse is followed by:

فَمَنْ تَابَ مِنْ بَعْدِ ظُلْمِهِ وَأَصْلَحَ فَإِنَّ
اللّٰهَ يَتُوبُ عَلَيْهِ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ غَفُورٌ رَّحِيمٌ ۝ مائده آيت ۳۹

"But whoso repenteth after his wrongdoing and amendeth, lo ! Allāh will relent toward him. Lo ! Allāh is Forgiving, Merciful".
(Qur'ān 5:39)

According to Muslim law if a guilty person sincerely repents and tries his best to abstain from wrong doing in future it is expected that Allāh will forgive him in the Hereafter. In other words, Ḥudūd (punishments) are corrective and preventive, but they are not a guarantee that Allāh will surely relent guilty persons. The expression "Whosoever repenteth" indicates in clear terms that *Taubah* (repentance) is essential for forgiveness in the Hereafter.

Hanafis' second argument

The Holy Qur'ān says :

> The only reward of those who make war upon Allāh and His Messenger and strive after corruption in the land will be that they will be killed or crucified, or have their hands and feet on alternate sides cut off, or will be expelled out of the land.
>
> (Qur'ān 5·33)

> إِنَّمَا جَزٰٓؤُا الَّذِيْنَ يُحَارِبُوْنَ اللّٰهَ وَرَسُوْلَهٗ
> وَيَسْعَوْنَ فِي الْاَرْضِ فَسَادًا اَنْ يُّقَتَّلُوْٓا اَوْ يُصَلَّبُوْٓا
> اَوْ تُقَطَّعَ اَيْدِيْهِمْ وَاَرْجُلُهُمْ مِّنْ خِلَافٍ اَوْ يُنْفَوْا
> مِنَ الْاَرْضِ (مائدہ، آیت ۳۳)

Some commentators of the Qur'ān say that this verse refers to Murtaddīn (i.e., people who change their religion of Islam for another) whereas majority of them is of the opinion that the verse is intended for robbers and mischief makers. According to reliable Aḥādīth this verse was revealed in connection with the inhuman atrocities of Banū 'Uraynah against the Muslims of Madīnah. A few members of that tribe visited Madīnah and accepted Islam. As some of them were suffering from the disease of Istisqā (Ascites), the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) advised them to stay in the pasture of the camels of Baytul Māl (public treasury) in order to recoup their health. When they recovered, they killed those who were incharge of camels and took away some camels also. Later, they were apprehended and brought to Madīnah. These people might be of four categories, viz, (i) some of them might have committed murder, but did not rob any thing, (ii) some of them might have murdered as well as have taken away some property, (iii) Some of them might have plundered things but did not slay any person; and (iv) others could neither kill any man nor take away any thing. Punishments are prescribed in the Qur'ān according to their respective crimes, i.e. culprits of the first category must be killed only; those of the second, must be crucified and killed, and the remaining punishments are intended for the third and fourth groups of culprits. After the description of punishments Allāh says :

> Such will be their degradation in the world, and, in the Hereafter theirs will be an awful doom. (Qur'ān 5:33)

> ذٰلِكَ لَهُمْ خِزْيٌ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَلَهُمْ
> فِي الْاٰخِرَةِ عَذَابٌ عَظِيْمٌ۔ المائدہ آیت ۳۳

The last sentence in the Qur'ānic verse definitely proves that *Taubah* (repentance) is indispensably necessary. Thus the view of the Ḥanafīs in this respect is nearer to the truth than that of the Shāfi'īs. Anyhow, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar's arguments, as discussed before, are apparently against the view of the Ḥanafīs, but do not prove the stand of the Shāfi'īs in this respect with certainty.

There is a *Ḥadīth* in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (Vol. II page 64) that a certain woman of Banū Makhzūm committed theft, and members of her family sent Ḥaḍrat Usāmah to recommend her case before the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). The Apostle was rather displeased and said to Usāmah:

Do you recommend against the Ḥudūd (prescribed) punishments.

أَتَشْفَعُ فِي حَدٍّ مِنْ حُدُودِ اللهِ

One of her hands was cut off. Afterward Ḥaḍrat 'Ā'ishah (mother of the Faithful) is reported to have said that the woman made *Taubah* (repentance) sincerely. The fact that punishment and penitence have been mentioned in the Qur'ān separately signifies that *Taubah* is necessary even after the enforcement of Ḥudūd (punishmets). It is also mentioned in *Ṭaḥāwī* that a certain person confessed his theft before the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) who enforced the prescribed permission for him and directed him to make *Taubah* before Allāh. The Apostle was himsef pleased to recommend his case to Allāh "O my Lord ! Be gracious enough to accept his penitence". The Holy Prophet's direction to the guilty man to make *Taubah* even after punishment leaves no room for doubt that *Taubah* is indispensable for forgiveness in the Hereafter. Similarly, Mā'iz Aslamī who confessed his adultery before the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) insisted on the enforcement of the prescribed punishments. When it was done, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) warned the people against speaking ill of him and told them "Pray for His forgiveness." This fact also proves that *Taubah* is always necessary for salvation in the next world.

Some critics say that if natural calamities are helpful in alleviating our sins, as stated in several Aḥādīth, punishments, awarded according to Islam, will all the more do the same. Shaykh ul-Hind Maulānā Maḥmūdul Ḥasan says in reply that natural calamities and religious punishments are not similar in nature. In the former case a sinful person does not know the nature of his sins whereas in the latter case he knows it.

The statement of Shaykh ul-Hind on Hudud

The sum and substance of Shaykh ul-Hind's statement is that according to the Shāfi'īs Ḥudūd (punishments) are atonement (*Kaffārah*) and purify sinful persons and they are also menace by the way. But according to Ḥanafīs, Ḥudūd are threats and a moral lesson in the first instance, and by the way they (Ḥudūd) may become a means of expiation and purification also. In this way the apparent contradiction in the Aḥādīth noted above is removed. It goes without saying that severe punishments like whipping and stoning to death are likely to alleviate and purify guilty persons in the long run.

CHAPTER XII

IT IS RELIGIOUS TO RUN AWAY FROM MISCHIEF.

18 We have been told by 'Abdullāh bin Māslamah via Mālik via 'AbdulRaḥmān bin 'Abdullāh bin 'Abdul Raḥmān bin Abū Ṣa'ṣa'ah via his father ('Abdullāh) who heard Abī Sa'īd al-Khudrī say:

✶ The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "A time will come when the best property of a Muslim will be his sheep which he will carry to the top of the mountain and places of rainfall (in the valleys) in order to escape with his religion from perfidy and tumult."

بَابٌ مِنَ الدِّينِ الْفِرَارُ مِنَ الْفِتَنِ[12]

18 حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللهِ بْنُ مَسْلَمَةَ عَنْ مَالِكٍ عَنْ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمٰنِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللهِ ابْنِ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمٰنِ بْنِ أَبِي صَعْصَعَةَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ أَبِي سَعِيدٍ الْخُدْرِيِّ أَنَّهُ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يُوشِكُ أَنْ يَكُونَ خَيْرَ مَالِ الْمُسْلِمِ غَنَمٌ يَتْبَعُ بِهَا شَعَفَ الْجِبَالِ وَمَوَاقِعَ الْقَطْرِ يَفِرُّ بِدِينِهِ مِنَ الْفِتَنِ ؛

The theme of the chapter

Hitherto those matters relating to Faith were described which are positive in nature, and now negative matters regarding Faith are mentioned.

"يفر بدينه من الفتن" The letter "*Ba*" here may signify cause, i.e., "a Muslim will run away from home for protecting his religion." ; and it may also indicate purpose and object, i.e. a Muslim will go from place to place in order to protect his religion. In my opinion the letter "با" means with, i. e. a Muslim will run away along with his Faith, just as the expression "فر بثوبه" means that it (the stone) fled away with the clothes of (Prophet Moses, peace be on him).[1]

Imām Bukhārī refutes here the views of the Murjites who believe that no sin or crime affects Faith. When mischiefs and corruptions can harm Faith to such an extent that it is religious duty to run away from them in order to protect Faith, sins and crimes can all the more affect the same. There is a *Ḥadīth* in Abū Dā'ūd and Tirmidhī to the effect that before the advent of the Day of Resurrection corruptions and mischiefs will cover the world as dark nights do, and the people remaining seated in one place will be better than those who run from place to place and those who will walk slowly will be in advantage, in preference to those who walk fast. Further, at that time a man who is a Believer, in the morning may not remain so in the evening and vice versa. There is another *Ḥadīth* in Abū Dā'ūd and Tirmidhī that at that time it will be extremely difficult for a man to remain patient and steadfast and that the person who will act on the teachings of Islam at that time will get reward equal to the reward due to fifty persons for the same work.

What is said above must not be confused with *Rahbānīyat* (monasticism). The meaning of the above *Ḥadīth* is that in cases of emergency it will be more advantageous to remain aloof from society than mix with the people freely. Muslim scholars maintain that in normal conditions those persons who are really competent enough to guide the people on the right path by means of their precepts and practices must not lead secluded life. They must boldly face the circumstances and assist the people in religious matters. Moreover, by preaching they will be able to increase the number of Muslims. There is a *Ḥadīth* in Musnad Aḥmad (Vol. I page 357) which says that whosoever resides in a forest (leaving the busy place) oppresses himself. Anyhow, different cases of secluded and social life must be considered on their merits.

Running away from corruption and Rahbaniyat

As said above, running away from a place of corruption to a lonely place of safety is not Rahbānīyat (monasticism) which was a practice invented by the Christians. It was a Bid'at (or innovation) having nothing to do with religion. The Holy Qur'ān refers to this Bid'at in the following words :

But monasticism they invented—We ordained it not for them—only seeking Allāh's pleasure, and they observed it not with right observance. (Qur'ān 57:27)

وَرَهْبَانِيَّةَ نِ ابْتَدَعُوهَا مَا كَتَبْنٰهَا
عَلَيْهِمْ اِلَّا ابْتِغَآءَ رِضْوَانِ اللّٰهِ فَمَا رَعَوْهَا
حَقَّ رِعَايَتِهَا ج الحديد آيت ٢٧

---

[1] This sentence refers to the event of Prophet Moses (*'alaihi al-salām*) who used to take bath in privacy. His opponents criticised him saying that he must have some physical defect otherwise he could take bath openly like others. One day when Prophet Moses, (peace be on him) was bathing after putting his clothes on a stone, the stone (by order of Allāh) ran away with his clothes and he ran after it. In this way the people witnessed that Prophet Moses (peace be on him) was free from physical defects. The movement of the stone was a divine miracle. 'Abdul Raḥmān

The expression (only seeking Allāh's pleasure) proves that "Rahbānīyat" is decidedly against the principles of Islam which is a natural and rational religion. The above-mentioned *Hadīth* only refers to cases of emergency only .

Secluded and social life

Both of these have bright and dark sides. If one realises that one's social life stands in the way of religious duties, one must prefer loneliness to company. But if one believes that by movning freely in society one will have an ample opportunity to preach the religion of Allāh to the people at large, one must lead social life.

As the chief mission of Prophets of Allāh was to reform mankind in the best way possible and convey the commandments of Allāh to His slaves, it was indispensably necessary for them to mix with them freely and frequently.

Though the word "Ghanam" means goats, غَنَمٌ يَتْبَعُ بِهَا شَعَفَ الْجِبَالِ وَمَوَاقِعَ الْقَطْرِ it stands here for small belongings which one can easily move from one place to another. As goats are generally submissive, fast in breeding and convenient in respect of giving milk, this word has been used. The word "Sha'af (plural of Sha'fatun) means top of mountain and Qatr (plural of Qatratun) means rain.[1]

CHAPTER XIII
THE SAYING OF THE PROPHET
(*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*)

I know Allāh more than you all, and varily knowledge is an action of heart and Allāh says: "But He will take you to task for that which your hearts have garnered."
(Qur'ān, 2:225)

19. We have been told by Muhammad bin Salām Bekandī who said that he was informed by 'Abdah via Hishām via his father ('Arwah) who heard Hadrat 'Āyishah say,

✱ When the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) ordered (the people) to do something he gave them such orders as were within their capacity,

They said: "O Allāh's Apostle! We are not like you. Allāh has forgiven your past and future sins." This angered him and the anger was apparent on his face. He said. "I am the most God-fearing and I know Allāh better than all of you."

بَابُ 13 قَوْلُ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
أَنَا أَعْلَمُكُمْ بِاللهِ وَأَنَّ الْمَعْرِفَةَ فِعْلُ الْقَلْبِ
لِقَوْلِ اللهِ تَعَالَى وَلٰكِنْ يُؤَاخِذُكُمْ بِمَا كَسَبَتْ
قُلُوبُكُمْ.

19. حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ سَلَامٍ قَالَ أَنَا عَبْدَةُ
عَنْ هِشَامٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ عَائِشَةَ قَالَتْ كَانَ
رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ إِذَا أَمَرَهُمْ
أَمَرَهُمْ مِنَ الْأَعْمَالِ بِمَا يُطِيقُونَ قَالُوا إِنَّا لَسْنَا
كَهَيْئَتِكَ يَا رَسُولَ اللهِ إِنَّ اللهَ قَدْ غَفَرَ لَكَ مَا
تَقَدَّمَ مِنْ ذَنْبِكَ وَمَا تَأَخَّرَ فَيَغْضَبُ حَتَّى يُعْرَفُ
الْغَضَبُ فِي وَجْهِهِ ثُمَّ يَقُولُ إِنَّ أَتْقَاكُمْ
وَأَعْلَمَكُمْ بِاللهِ أَنَا.

'Ilm and Ma'rifat

These two words have almost similar meaning. This is why in some editions of Sahih Bukhārī "اعرفكم" replaces "اعلمكم". But there is some difference between " 'Ilm" and "Ma'rifat". In the first place, the word " 'Ilm" requires two objects. e.g., "علمت زيداً فاضلاً" means I know Zayd to be a learned man and "Ma'rifat" needs one object only e.g., "عرفت زيداً" meens I knew (or recognised), Zayd. In the second place, if one's previous knowledge of a certain thing corresponds to the same when it is actually in existence it is called "Ma'rifat". The Holy Qur'ān says :

---

[1] The subject matter of this *Hadith* seems to be based on the story of the people of the cave *Ashāb Kahf* mentioned in the sūrah al-Kahf (Sūrah No. 18) of the Holy Qur'ān. For details see Sharh-i-Bukhārī Vol. I, page 365.

They (the people of the Scriptures) recognise it (the revelation) as they recognise their sons. (Qur'ān 2.146)

يَعْرِفُونَهُ كَمَا يَعْرِفُونَ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ ۔ بقره آیت ١٤٦

In other words, they knew that the Final Prophet Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was exactly the same in appearance and qualities as was mentioned in their holy Scriptures, but they did not recognise him as such, simply on account of their enmity and hatred. In another place the Qur'ān says :

When there cometh unto them that which they know (to be the Truth), they disbelieve therein. (Qur'ān 2:89)

فَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ مَّا عَرَفُوا كَفَرُوا بِهِ (بقره، آیت ٨٩)

In short " 'Ilm" is generally used for qualities and "Ma'rifat" for person. For example, "علمت زيداً كريماً" means I know Zayd to be generous. Here " 'Ilm" relates to Zayd's generosity, whereas "عرفت زيداً" means I recognised Zayd himself. It may also be said that Ma'rifat is like 'Taṣawwur' (concept in mind) and 'Ilm is like Taṣdīq (actual existence). Anyhow, the two words are often used in each other's place. They are almost synonymous terms.

The object of Imam Bukhari

Bukhārī has divided the saying of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) into two parts, viz. (i) "I know Allāh more than you all" and (ii) "verily, knowledge is a work of heart". The commentators of Aḥādīth generally say that the two parts are separate things, i.e. the first part means "I possess more knowledge of Allāh than all of you" A'lam is an adjective of comparative degree, and when knowledge of Allāh has degrees, Īmān (Belief) also has degrees. The other part aims at refuting the view of the sect of Karāmiyah who maintain that it is enough to say "There is no god but Allāh" whether one has full knowledge of Allāh or not. But this is not correct.

In my opinion the second part of *Ḥadīth* is an explanation of the first, because none says that 'Ilm (knowledge) as such is Īmān but Ma'rifat, which is a work of heart and is voluntary, must be taken into account. Just as 'Ilm has various degrees, so also Ma'rifat has degrees. Like Ma'rifat Imān also has degrees. The Holy Qur'ān says, "But He will take you to task for that which your hearts have garnered."
(Qur'ān 2:225)

The commentators of Aḥādīth are perplexed on this point. Because the claim is that Ma'rifat (knowledge) is a work of heart and the Qur'ānic verse relates to "Aimān (meaning oaths)". Īmān (Belief) and Aimān (oaths) are two dtfferent things altogether.

From Imām Bukhārī's explanation of the above *Ḥadīth* it is proved that Īmān increases and decreases. Firstly on the ground that the saying of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "I know more than you all" is in the comparative degree which indicates that the speaker (i.e. Holy Prophet) and the addressees (i.e. Prophet's Companions) both possess knowledge but the former has higher degree of knowledge than the latter. Secondly the saying of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "I know Allāh more than you all" shows that degree of '*Ilm* and "Ma'rifat" here is meant which is the fruit of Īmān (and that is obtained by means of Faith only). Thus there are different degrees or stages of '*Ilm* and Ma'rifat. One stage of the same is obtained before Īmān (Belief) and this is essential even for a humble Believer, because without '*Ilm* Īmān cannot be conceived. The second stage of '*Ilm* and Ma'rifat is reached after Īmān (and this is the fruit of Īmān). This stage has also various ranks. One is procured by all Walīs and Ṣūfīs, one was obtained by the Companions of the Holy Prophet in general, one was achieved by those who enjoyed the position of Ṣiddīq, one was available for all Prophets, and the highest rank was reserved for the Final Apostle of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) who possessed all kinds of knowledge regarding the former and latter peoples and things.

Stages of Knowledge

Different stages of knowledge are proved by the following verse of the Holy Qur'ān :

Allāh will exalt those who believe among you, and those who have knowledge, to high ranks. (Qur'ān, 58:11)

يَرْفَعَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَالَّذِيْنَ
اُوْتُوا الْعِلْمَ دَرَجٰتٍ ط (المجادلہ، آیت ۱۱)

It is obvious that "Those who have knowledge are mentioned here as a distinguished class of the Believers". Hence that kind of knowledge is not intended here on which *Īmān* rests (because every Believer has it), but that kind of knowledge is meant here which is not available for all Muslims. The Holy Qur'ān says :

And say : My Lord ! increase me in knowledge. (Qur'ān, 20:114)

وَقُلْ رَّبِّ زِدْنِيْ عِلْمًا۔ طٰہٰ آیت ۱۱۴

Here Allāh directs His Apostle to ask for increase in knowledge. It is obvious that knowledge here does not mean ordinary knowledge available for other people. Here that highest degree of knowledge is intended which was beyond the reach of other divines and Prophets. As a matter of fact, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) who was endowed with all kinds of knowledge, was directed by Allāh to ask for more knowledge. In other words, the degree of knowledge which the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was directed by Allāh to pray for, was above what he already possessed.

It may be added here that the Holy Qur'ān generally mentions the stages and degrees of knowledge (which are fruits of Faith and which are obtained after *Īmān*) by the word 'Ilm, as it is clear from the above-quoted verses.

The word "Ma'rifat" ordinarily refers to that knowledge on which *Īmān* depends and which is procured before *Īmān* which is both voluntary and involuntary. The above-quoted verses "They recognise it (Revelation) as they recognise their sons" and "So when there came to them what they recognised (to be the truth) they disbelieved therein" point to the same conclusion, viz, that knowledge is meant here which is available before *Īmān* (Belief).

Of course, one verse of the Qur'ān mentions the word "Ma'rifat" in the sense of that knowledge which is one of the fruits of *Īmān* and which is obtained after *Īmān*; as under:

When they listen to that which hath been revealed unto the Messenger, thou seest their eyes overflow with tears because of their recognition of the Truth. (Qur'an, 5:83)

وَاِذَا سَمِعُوْا مَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَى الرَّسُوْلِ تَرٰٓى
اَعْيُنَهُمْ تَفِيْضُ مِنَ الدَّمْعِ مِمَّا عَرَفُوْا مِنَ
الْحَقِّ ج (مائدہ، آیت ۸۳)

A section of the people of the Holy Scriptures recognised the truth of Islam. Here "Ma'rifat" does not mean that knowledge on which *Īmān* depends and which is obtained before *Īmān*—may it be voluntary or involuntary. Because the people of the Scriptures generally had this sort of knowledge already—though they did not confess it on account of malice and hatred. Hence in this verse of the Qur'ān that kind of knowledge is intended which is one of the results of *Īmān* (Belief) and which is available as a result of *Īmān*. On behalf of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah it may be said that the knowledge intended in "I know more than you all" or 'I recognise more than you all" is that knowledge which is one of the fruits of *Īmān* and which follows *Īmān*. Hence increase and decrease are related to the things connected with *Īmān* not to *Īmān* itself.

"And verily knowledge is a work of heart". On وَإِنَّ الْمَعْرِفَةَ فِعْلُ الْقَلْبِ the basis of this saying of the Holy Prophet Imām Bukhārī refutes the theory of the sect of Karāmiyah who hold that it is sufficient to assert "There is no god but Allāh" and belief in heart is not necessary. Because the Prophet's saying "I know Allāh more than you all" indicates that knowledge of Allāh is indispensably necessary for *Īmān*. Again, as knowledge is sometimes voluntary and sometimes involuntary, Imām Bukhārī has explained the sentence "Verily knowledge is an action of heart", by saying that spontaneous or involuntary knowledge is not beneficial for *Īmān*. For *Īmān*, only that knowledge will be valuable which is intentional and proceeds from the core of heart.

"But He will take you to task for لِقَوْلِ اللهِ تَعَالَى وَلٰكِنْ يُّؤَاخِذُكُمْ بِمَا كَسَبَتْ قُلُوْبُكُمْ that which your hearts have garnered". As said above, the commentators of *Aḥādīth* find it difficult to explain the connection of this verse with the subject matter here.

"*Īmān*" which means belief and "*Aimān*" which means oath, are different words altogether. What is then the cause of quoting this verse in connection with *Īmān*.

Late Shāh Ṣāḥib has said that Imām Bukhārī's argument is based on the expression "which your hearts garnered" i.e., according to the verse of the Qur'ān heart works and Bukhārī desires to prove that Ma'rifat (Knowledge or recognition) is also a work of heart.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that Zayd bin Aslam, a distinguished Tābi'ī (Companion of the Prophet's Companions) and well-known commentator of the Qur'ān has explained the above-quoted Qur'ānic verse as follows:—

Allāh, the Most Exalted, says that "He will not take you to task for that which is unintentional in your oaths" (Now Zayd bin Aslam says). This is just like the saying of a person that if he does so and so he is a disbeliever. Then Allāh will not take him to task for this unless he believes in what he says.

قَوْلُهٗ تَعَالَى لَا يُؤَاخِذُكُمُ اللهُ بِاللَّغْوِ فِيْٓ أَيْمَانِكُمْ هُوَ كَقَوْلِ الرَّجُلِ إِنْ فَعَلْتُ كَذَا فَأَنَا كَافِرٌ قَالَ لَا يُؤَاخِذُهُ اللهُ بِذٰلِكَ حَتّٰى يَعْقِدَ بِهٖ قَلْبُهٗ -

Thus Aslam means to say that '*Aqīdah* (belief) and Ma'rifat (knowledge) convey almost the same meaning. Now I say that there is a still more clear argument in support of the above. Ibn Kathīr has narrated from Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās and Ḥaḍrat Mujāhid that if a person swears and he knows that he is speaking falsely then he will be taken to task, otherwise not. They have explained the word "*Kasb*" (work) as '*Ilm* (knowledge) and therefore they have said that the condition of taking a person to task is that he knows that he is actually a liar. Hence it is clear that '*Ilm* and Ma'rifat are works of hearts.

إِذَا أَمَرَهُمْ أَمَرَهُمْ مِنَ الْأَعْمَالِ بِمَا يُطِيقُونَ

It is narrated by Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah (رضی اللہ عنہا) that when he (the Holy Prophet صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) ordered the people to do certain work he gave them such orders as were within their capacity. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has also said. "The best work near Allāh is that which is perpetual though it may be small." Islam is a natural religion and therefore does not give such orders as are beyond the scope of man. All injunctions of Islam are within human scope. So there is no question of reduction or concession in any of them. It may be added that Prophets of Allāh endured all kinds of hardship, but extended facilities to their followers. The Final Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) remained engaged in temporal and religious work days and nights, but always extended favourable consideration to his *Ummat* (followers) in every possible way, the Holy Qur'ān says:

(There hath come unto you a Messenger, (one) of yourselves,) unto whom aught that ye are overburdened is grievous, full of concern for you, for the Believers full of pity, merciful (Qur'ān, 9:128)

عَزِيزٌ عَلَيْهِ مَا عَنِتُّمْ حَرِيصٌ عَلَيْكُمْ
بِالْمُؤْمِنِينَ رَءُوفٌ رَّحِيمٌ ۝ توبہ آیت ۱۲۸.

Furthermore, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) always advised officers and workers to be lenient, and never to be hard, to the people. He moved heaven and earth for the reformation of the people, and the chief object of his mission was to protect them against evil and immoral acts and guide them on the right path leading to happiness in this world and salvation in the next.

Jihād is not an offence nor that which aims at unnecessary bloodshed or illegal occupation of other people's territories. Jihād (Islamic war) is essentially a defensive war which aims at defending its own country and eliminating all kinds of oppression, tyranny, corruption, exploitation from the world.

قَالُوا إِنَّا لَسْنَا كَهَيْئَتِكَ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ قَدْ غَفَرَ لَكَ

They (the Companions) said : "O Apostle of Allāh! we are not like you. Allāh has forgiven your past sin and that which is to come".

Some companions of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) asked Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah regarding his religious occupations. Their object was to follow in the footsteps of the Prophet and do exactly what he did. When she described the programme of his occupation they regarded that it was a very limited amount of work. They thought that the Holy Prophet's all sins were forgiven by Allāh and so it was not necessary for him to work hard, but they must try to do more in order to get salvation. One of them proposed that he would fast for life, another said that he would keep away from his wife, and the third announced that he would always wage war (jihād).

When the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) came to know of the determination of some of his Companions, he got angry and the sign of anger was manifest on his appearance. Then he said: "I know Allāh and fear Him more than you do. The Companions' above statement was based on the following verse of the Qur'ān :

That Allāh may forgive thee of thy sin that which is past and that which is to come, and may perfect His favour unto thee, and may guide thee on a right path. (Qur'ān, 48:2)

لِيَغْفِرَ لَكَ اللَّهُ مَا تَقَدَّمَ مِنْ ذَنْبِكَ وَمَا
تَأَخَّرَ وَيُتِمَّ نِعْمَتَهُ عَلَيْكَ وَيَهْدِيَكَ صِرَاطًا
مُّسْتَقِيمًا (فتح، آیت ۲)

This verse was revealed after the Treaty of Ḥudaybiyah, which was apparently a treaty of defeat and disgrace for the Muslims but really it was a forerunner for their victories in future. For the first time Muslims were recognised by the Quraysh of Makkah as a separate and independent entity and the Muslims now had a vast scope for propagating their religion far and wide. This treaty was a mile stone in the history of Islam, which in course of two years led to the conquest of Makkah. For this reason this Sūrah of the Qur'ān is named *Al-Fatḥ* (Victory).

At this, signs of anger and sadness on فيغضب حتى يعرف الغضب في وجهه the sacred face of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) appeared. This *Ḥadīth* indicates the anger and sadness of the Holy Prophet.

The law of nature :

The proposals of some Companions were unnatural and irrational. The Holy Prophet did not object to the Companions' error of judgment, but expressed his displeasure if any unreasonable or unnatural suggestion was made by anyone. On this occasion he said : "I fear Allāh and know Allāh more than you do". He also said "In addition to performing religious duties I do other work also, e.g. I eat, I drink, I sleep, etc." The way he passed his life was a guarantee for the people's success in this world and Hereafter. If one leads a decent and honest life here and performs religious duties sincerely, one is sure to get favours from the Almighty. Both the temporal and spiritual sides of man's life must be developed as far as practicable. One may take part in scientific researches, commerce, trade, industry and other profession, but the method and means must be reasonable and honest.

Indeed I know and fear Allāh more إن أتقاكم وأعلمكم بالله أنا than you do. This *Ḥadīth* indicates the extreme eagerness and ambition of the Companions on the one hand and the Holy Prophets' adoption of moderate way of life on the other, as he observes "In addition to worship of Allāh I eat, drink, sleep and do other kinds of work, and still I know and fear Allāh more than you all do. If renunciation of the worldly affairs had been a good work near Allāh I would not have done anything beyond worship of Allāh" In this way the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has clearly stated that Allāh Himself has permitted us to do worldly work side by side with religious duties. If we perform all our duties with good motive and make them as part of devotion to Allāh, we will certainly get rewards and favours from Him. If we earn money, we must do it by fair and lawful means, and we must pay dues of wealth also. We must differentiate between lawful and unlawful sources in earning money. We may study modern sciences and adopt commerce and industry etc. as our profession but they must not spoil our beliefs and deeds. If Islamic principles are followed respectfully in various branches of life, the latter can become pillars of the Faith and our life may become part of our worship of Allāh.

An example of "I know more than you do"

To explain this point I give here one example. Every king has a set of rules to be followed by his subjects, but there is some special provision for the privileged class of the people. These persons know what action pleases the king and what displeases him. They always look at his temper and mood and behave exactly in the way which is sure to satisfy and please him. Similarly, Prophets of Allāh pass days and nights in communion with Allāh and carry out His orders to please him.

Ma'rifat (Knowledge) here does not mean the ordinary Ma'rifat intended for all people. This is reserved for Apostles of Allāh, particularly Head of Prophets (صلى الله عليه وسلم). For this reason "*A'raf*" and "*A'lam*" have been used in a comparative degree, meaning that he knows Allāh more than any body else. For our knowledge of Allāh we are to consider quality, not quantity. The Holy Prophet's assertion "Subḥān Allāh" one time is far more effective than our repetition of the same for thousand times. From this it can be inferred that Ma'rifat is the highest degree of *Īmān* (Faith), Brahmans, priests, jogīs and others practise various kinds of self-mortification, but it is worthless, because they have no sincere belief in the Creator. It may be added that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's saying "Faith means belief in heart and confession with tongue" has been thus proved, because Faith is complete "Ma'rifat."

CHAPTER XIV

Whosoever abhores to become a disbeliever again as he abhores to be thrown into fire, is a true Believer.

20. We have been told by Sulaymān bin Ḥarb who said that he was informed by Shu'bah via Qatādah who heard Ḥaḍrat Anas say,

✢ The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam* said : whosoever is imbued with three qualities will taste the sweetness of Faith. These are :

(i) Allāh and His Apostle are dearer to him than all else ;
(ii) Wnen he loves a person he does not love him but for Allāh's sake only ; and
(iii) he hates to revert to disbelief as he hates to be thrown into the fire of (hell).

بَابٌ 14 مَنْ كَرِهَ أَنْ يَعُودَ فِي الْكُفْرِ كَمَا
يَكْرَهُ أَنْ يُلْقَى فِي النَّارِ مِنَ الْإِيمَانِ
20 حَدَّثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ بْنُ حَرْبٍ قَالَ ثَنَا شُعْبَةُ
عَنْ قَتَادَةَ عَنْ أَنَسٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
قَالَ ثَلٰثٌ مَنْ كُنَّ فِيهِ وَجَدَ حَلَاوَةَ الْإِيمَانِ مَنْ
كَانَ اللهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَحَبَّ إِلَيْهِ مِمَّا سِوَاهُمَا وَمَنْ
أَحَبَّ عَبْدًا لَا يُحِبُّهُ إِلَّا لِلّٰهِ وَمَنْ يَكْرَهُ أَنْ يَعُودَ
فِي الْكُفْرِ بَعْدَ إِذْ أَنْقَذَهُ اللهُ كَمَا يَكْرَهُ أَنْ يُلْقَى
فِي النَّارِ ۔

This *Ḥadīth* and its three parts have been thoroughly discussed already. This *Ḥadīth* has been discussed in the chapter 9 under the heading of "Taste of Belief". We have explained it in detail for the perusal of the readers.

The object of Imam Bukhari

Imām Bukhārī aims at refuting the views of the Murji'ah and all those people who hold that observance of Islamic injunctions is not necessary along with belief and that no sin can affect Faith, The Imām stresses the point that Belief must be strengthened by good deeds, and the beauty and sweetness of Belief rests on virtuous work. The better is one's deeds, the sweeter will be one's Belief. *Īmān* and work are inter-related, and one is cemented by the other. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) means to say that just as a person is apt to obtain delicious and tasteful things so also he must do good deeds in order to procure sweetness of *Īmān* (Belief).

"Who abhores to become a disbeliever أَنْ يَعُودَ فِي الْكُفْرِ بَعْدَ إِذْ أَنْقَذَهُ اللهُ again, after Allāh saved him from infidelity before, as he abhores to be thrown into fire." This *Ḥadīth* may apply to the people who embrace Islam for the first time and also to those who are hereditary Muslims. Because when a new convert to Islam dislikes to become a disbeliever again a hereditary Muslim will dislike it all the more and he must be more aware of the taste and sweetness of Faith.

CHAPTER XV

Some Believers will excel others on the basis of good work,

21. We have been told by Ismā'īl who said that he was informed by Mālik via 'Amr bin Yaḥyā al-Māzinī via his father who heard Ḥaḍrat Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī say;

✶ The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said : "When the people of Paradise would have entered Paradise and the people of Hell would have gone to Hell (after the final reckoning) Allāh would order those who have even a grain of faith to be taken out of Hell. So they will be taken out of it, but by then they will have been charred and will therefore, be put in the River of Rain or of Life (the narrator Mālik) is in doubt as to which term was used by the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). They will rejuvinate just as a grain revives near the bank of a flood channel. Dont you see it comes out yellow (and) twisted? Wuhayb said: 'Amr binYaḥyā narrated this *Ḥadīth* to me, in which he said "stream of life and *khayr* (good work) instead of *Imān*."

بَابٌ 15 تَفَاضُلِ أَهْلِ الْإِيْمَانِ فِي الْأَعْمَالِ

21 - حَدَّثَنَا إِسْمٰعِيْلُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِيْ مَالِكٌ عَنْ عَمْرِو بْنِ يَحْيَى الْمَازِنِيِّ عَنْ أَبِيْهِ عَنْ أَبِيْ سَعِيْدِ الْخُدْرِيِّ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ يَدْخُلُ أَهْلُ الْجَنَّةِ الْجَنَّةَ وَأَهْلُ النَّارِ النَّارَ ثُمَّ يَقُوْلُ اللّٰهُ أَخْرِجُوْا مَنْ كَانَ فِيْ قَلْبِهٖ مِثْقَالُ حَبَّةٍ مِّنْ خَرْدَلٍ مِّنْ إِيْمَانٍ فَيُخْرَجُوْنَ مِنْهَا قَدِ اسْوَدُّوْا فَيُلْقَوْنَ فِيْ نَهَرِ الْحَيَا أَوِ الْحَيَاةِ شَكَّ مَالِكٌ فَيَنْبُتُوْنَ كَمَا تَنْبُتُ الْحَبَّةُ فِيْ جَانِبِ السَّيْلِ أَلَمْ تَرَ أَنَّهَا تَخْرُجُ صَفْرَاءَ مُلْتَوِيَةً قَالَ وُهَيْبٌ حَدَّثَنَا عَمْرٌو الْحَيَاةِ وَقَالَ خَرْدَلٍ مِّنْ خَيْرٍ ؞

Imam Bukhari's purpose

Bukhārī has narrated here two *Aḥādīth* with a view to refuting the views of the Murji'ahs. He means to say that Believers excel one another on the basis of their good work. Difference in their position may be in this world or the next. Some people fortunately do good work here and others do not. If some Muslims who were put in the Hell have Belief in their hearts, they will be taken out of it and will be sent to Paradise. This change will be the result of the intercession of Prophets of Allāh according to the good work done by Muslims in this world. Imām Bukhārī likes to stress various stages and degrees of Faith; and as Faith and Belief are synonyms in his opinion, there will be increase and decrease in Belief also. Like Imām Bukhārī, Imām Muslim has also narrated this *Ḥadīth* of Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī in some detail. The latter has said that sinful Believers will be taken out of the Hell on the intercession of Apostle of Allāh. Allāh Himself will take initiations in the matter. It will be under His inspiration that Prophets will recommend deserving cases for His favours and He will be then pleased to order that those people who have in their heart Belief even of the weight of a grain of mustard-seed must be transferred from Hell to Paradise. Now the question is : Who are the addressees of the verb "Akhrijū" (i.e. take out) in the above *Ḥadīth*. Some scholars say that Prophets and Believers are addressed here, and others say that Angels are intended here. The word "*Ḥabbatun*" means grain, and its plural is "*Ḥubūb*"[1]

Spiritual matters will be manifest in the Hereafter

The rules and regulations of the Hereafter and spiritual matters will be known to the Believers in general. But different persons will appreciate them according to their merits and eminence. In one narration of Sa'īd al-Khudrī's *Ḥadīth*, the word "انظروا" (meaning, Look here) and in another the word "ارجعوا" (Return) have been used.

---

[1] For the Chapter on "increase and decrease of *Imān* (Belief) vide *Sharḥ-i-Bukhārī*" pages 374-379.

Comprehensive knowledge is reserved for Allah

Allāh is Omniscient and His knowledge encompasses every thing of this world and of the next, and His created beings have also partial knowledge according to their merits. "And over every lord of knowledge there is one more knowing." (the Qur'ān, 12:76). It is possible that a person's *Nūr-i-Īmān* (light of Belief) may be known to Allāh only and to none else (not even His Apostles or chosen *Ṣūfīs*). It is also possible that Allāh's Prophets know a man's light of Belief and nobody else, and so on. It is said in Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī's *Ḥadīth* that after the transference of sinful Muslims from Hell to Paradise, the Believers will address Allāh saying "Our God! None is now left in Hell who had even slight amount of *Īmān* in his heart", though after this also a large number of people will be taken out of Hell, and they will be called "freed slaves of Allāh." Ḥaḍrat Anas has narrated a *Ḥadīth* in which the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) will announce third or fourth time, "Our God! None remains now in Hell save those who are restricted by the order of the Holy Qur'ān—though after that also many sinful persons will be taken out of Hell by the hand of the Almighty who will be known as "freed slaves of Allāh".

Refutation of the Murji'ah and Mutazilites :

The above *Ḥadīth* refutes the theory of the Murji'ah who maintain that work is not necessary for *Īmān* and no sin can affect one's Faith. 'Allāmah Badruddīn 'Aynī says ; In the first place, this *Ḥadīth* is a strong evidence in support of the "people of Sunnat and Jamā'at" and in repudiation of the Murji'ah in as far as it has been proved that a section of sinful Muslims will be thrown into Hell. In the second place, this *Ḥadīth* rejects the views of the Mutazilites who hold that some Believers will perpetually remain in Hell on account of sins, whereas this *Ḥadīth* says unmistakable terms that sinful Believers will be taken out of Hell 'they will not remain in Hell for all times to come'.

Stream of *Ḥayāt* or *Ḥayā* :

The narrator of the aforesaid *Ḥadīth* doubts as to which one is correct. Imām Bukhārī quoting the narration of Wuhayb likes to say that the "Stream of *Ḥayāt*" is correct. "*Ḥayāt*" means rain which revives earth after death. Hence it may be called stream of rain or stream of life. It may be added that sinful Muslim will first be put into the stream of life, which is close to Paradise so that they may be refreshed after having taken bath therein.

22. We have been told by Muḥammad bin 'Ubaydullāh who said that he was informed by Ibrāhīm bin Sa'īd via Ṣāliḥ via Ibn Shihāb via Abū Umāmah bin Sahl bin Ḥunayf that he heard Ḥaḍrat Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī say :

✱ The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said :

When I was asleep I saw (in my dream) that the people were brought before me. Some of them had shirts up to their breasts and some had shorter shirts, and 'Umar bin Khaṭṭāb was presented before me robed in a gown of abnormal length which he occasionally lifted while walking. The Companions asked the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) about the interpretation of his dream, He replied that it referred to Faith.

22 - حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُبَيْدِ اللّٰهِ قَالَ ثَنَا
إِبْرَاهِيْمُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ عَنْ صَالِحٍ عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ عَنْ
أَبِيْ أُمَامَةَ بْنِ سَهْلِ بْنِ حُنَيْفٍ أَنَّهُ سَمِعَ أَبَا
سَعِيْدِ نِ الْخُدْرِيَّ يَقُوْلُ قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى
اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَيْنَا أَنَا نَائِمٌ رَأَيْتُ النَّاسَ
يُعْرَضُوْنَ عَلَيَّ وَعَلَيْهِمْ قُمُصٌ مِّنْهَا مَا يَبْلُغُ
الثُّدِيَّ وَمِنْهَا مَا دُوْنَ ذٰلِكَ وَعُرِضَ عَلَيَّ عُمَرُ بْنُ
الْخَطَّابِ وَعَلَيْهِ قَمِيْصٌ يَجُرُّهٗ قَالُوْا فَمَا أَوَّلْتَ
ذٰلِكَ يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ قَالَ الدِّيْنَ ٭

Ta'wwul in the *Ḥadīth* means interpretation. And he (Prophet Joseph) placed his parents on the dias and they fell down before him prostrate, and he said: O my father! this is the *Tāwīl* (interpretation) of my dream of old (The Qur'ān, 12:100).

According to subsequent Muslim scholars *Tāwīl* means to use a word or expression in a sense other than the original or literal. Anyhow the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) meant to say that the religious position of several Believers was shown to him, and he inferred from the length of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar's gown that he was very highly accomplished in religious matters. Imām Bukhārī means to say that there are different stages and degrees of *Īmān*; and as Faith and *Īmān* are synonyms in his opinion, Faith also has different stages and degrees (i.e. it may also increase or decrease). But, as stated above, Faith is a combination of *Īmān* and Islam, and hence it is not proved that *Īmān* can increase or decrease. Of course, there is difference in the rank and position of Believers on the basis of good deeds and none denies it.

An objection and a reply

From the above *Ḥadīth* one must not infer that Ḥaḍrat 'Umar excels Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, because it is possible that the latter was not then presented to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) as his real position had already been well-known. Ḥaḍrat 'Umar was presented as the second best Muslim as the first rank of Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq was already proved by reference to the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth* and this is an undeniable fact. It is recorded in history that Ḥaḍrat Usāmah was ordered by the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) on the eve of his demise to lead a military expedition to Syria. All Muslims including Ḥaḍrat 'Umar were opposed to this expedition on the ground that Madīnah would be exposed to danger. But Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr announced with full vigour that the expedition arranged by the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) must proceed according to the schedule so that the enemy might not think that the Muslims were weak and afraid of implementing even the orders of their own Apostle. This bold policy of Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr was a great success, and the enemy realised that the Muslims were powerful enough to send an army to a foreign land.

Superiority of Abu Bakr Siddiq

The above *Ḥadīth* simply indicates the partial excellence of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar, whereas Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq has an all-round excellence. It is obvious that in case of comparison the latter will be regarded superior to the former. Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq's excellence is proved by the Holy Qur'ān and Mutawātir *Aḥādīth* (i.e. they are transmitted by a large number of reliable narrators) whereas that of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar is proved by *Khabari Wāḥid* (that *Ḥadīth* which is handed down by one reliable authority only). It may be said that sometimes partial excellence is also a source of envy. For example, it is related in *Aḥādīth* that on the Day of Judgment "Mu'adhdhin" (one who calls for prayer) will be seated on bright couches and even Apostles of Allāh will envy their position. This is purely a partial excellence of "Mu'adhdhin", but it is insignificant in comparison with the established eminence of Prophets of Allāh.

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is reported to have said "I have transferred to Abū Bakr's heart what was inspired to my heart by Allāh." So we must believe that Ḥaḍrat 'Umar's excellence is partial and that of Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr is all-round. After the Prophet's demise Ḥaḍrat 'Umar almost lost his sense, but Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr remained firm like a rock.

Excellence of 'Umar

The long gown referred to, in the above *Ḥadīth* points to the vast conquests and marvellous achievements of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar. A large number of 'Arab tribes who had been new converts to Islam relapsed into apostasy (Irtidād) immediately after the demise of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr, who reigned for two years and four months, faced the situation courageously and launched a campaign against the movement of apostasy. He succeeded in establishing the domination of Islam and of Muslims in neighbouring territories within a year. His military expeditions almost reached the borders of Damascus and he paved the way for further victories of his successor, Ḥaḍrat 'Umar who is said to have conquered about one thousand towns. About Ḥaḍrat 'Umar's excellence, there is one *Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (page 275) in which the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said. I took water out of a well, Abū Bakr did the same after me. When 'Umar's turn came his bucket was changed into a big vessel. 'Umar drew it with full vigour until all people got water and were fully satisfied.

CHAPTER XVI

Modesty is part of Faith.

23. We have been told by 'Abdullāh bin Yūsuf who said that he was informed by Mālik bin Anas via Ibn Shihāb via Sālim bin 'Abdullāh via his father.

✶'Abdullāh bin 'Umar: That the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) passed by an Anṣārī and he was giving advice to his brother about modesty. The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said to him, "Let him go, because modesty is part of Faith."

بَابٌ 16 اَلْحَيَاءُ مِنَ الْإِيمَانِ
23 حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللهِ بْنُ يُوسُفَ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا
مَالِكُ بْنُ أَنَسٍ عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ عَنْ سَالِمِ بْنِ
عَبْدِ اللهِ عَنْ أَبِيهِ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ مَرَّ عَلَى رَجُلٍ مِّنَ الْأَنْصَارِ وَهُوَ يَعِظُ أَخَاهُ
فِي الْحَيَاءِ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
دَعْهُ فَإِنَّ الْحَيَاءَ مِنَ الْإِيمَانِ ؂

Imam Bukhari's object

Imām Bukhārī's object is to prove that work is part of Faith, and work (spiritual or temporal) is necessary for Faith; otherwise Faith will be weakened. In this *Ḥadīth* the word "Min" (meaning from) may either indicate that work is part of Faith or that there is close relationship between the two. In any case it is proved that work is essential for Faith and abondonment of work harms faith, and this refutes the theory of those people who hold that work is not necessary for Faith. This *Ḥadīth* is narrated in *al-Adabul Mufrad* (chapter on Modesty) in which the expression "يعاتب اخاه" "he was admonishing his brother" replaces the expression "يعظ اخاه" "he was giving advice to his brother", as under :

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) passed by a person who was admonishing his brother about modesty as if he was telling him that modesty had harmed him. Then the Prophet said: Let him go, because modesty is a part of Faith.

مَرَّ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى رَجُلٍ
يُعَاتِبُ أَخَاهُ فِي الْحَيَاءِ حَتَّى كَأَنَّهُ يَقُولُ أَضَرَّ بِكَ
فَقَالَ دَعْهُ فَإِنَّ الْحَيَاءَ مِنَ الْإِيمَانِ۔

The second *Ḥadīth* indicates that the Anṣārī was advising his brother, out of sympathy not to be modest in his business, as it somehow stood in the way of making necessary demands on the people. The

Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) advised him not to say so, as modesty is part of Faith. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is also reported to have said:

> Of the words of Prophethood that have come down to the people, one is. "If you have no modesty, then do what you like."
>
> إِنَّ مِمَّا أَدْرَكَ النَّاسُ مِنْ كَلَامِ النُّبُوَّةِ إِذَا لَمْ تَسْتَحْيِ فَاصْنَعْ مَا شِئْتَ، الادب المفرد الجزء، الثانی ص۵۲

Modesty has been enjoined by all Prophets

Imām Bukhārī has recorded this *Ḥadīth* in the chapter 271, and later in the chapter 639, of *al-Adabul Mufrad*, in which the expression "of the words of early Prophethood" replaces the expression "of the words of prophethood." The word *al-Nās* in the *Ḥadīth* might be either in the nominative case meaning that the words which the people obtained from Prophets, or in the objective case signifying that the words of Prophets reached the people. In both cases the substance is the same. In short, the valuable pieces of wisdom given by Apostles of Allāh from time to time have been the same. Nothing of them has been abrogated. One of these words of wisdom is that if one does not possess modesty and decency one can do anything one likes.

The word *Faṣna'* (meaning do) has been used in *Ḥadīth* in the imperative mood but it has the meaning of a verb of the indicative mood. Anyhow, Man's success in life rests on two points, (i) to beware of evil and abstain from it and (ii) to understand and adopt good acts. For these two points we cannot depend on reason only. We must seek guidance from the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth*. Reason without the aid of revelation sometimes misguides the people. Hence it is necessary that we must follow the teaching of our religion faithfully. It may be added that the subject matter of this *Ḥadīth* resembles this verse of the Qur'ān.

> Do what ye will. Lo! He is Seer of what ye do. (Qur'ān, 41:40)
>
> اِعْمَلُوا مَا شِئْتُمْ إِنَّهُ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ بَصِيرٌ
> (حٰمٓ السجدہ آیت ۴۰)

Disbelievers do not listen to the commandments of Allāh and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), though they know that there are signs of wisdom in everything from the heavens to the earth created by the Divine Being. This disbelief on their part is only due to their wickedness and enmity. So Allāh says that they may do what they like, but they cannot escape the doom that is in store for them in the Hereafter.

The above idea is expressed by a poet as follows:

إِذَا لَمْ تَخْشَ عَاقِبَةَ اللَّيَالِي وَلَمْ تَسْتَحْيِ فَاصْنَعْ مَا تَشَاءُ

If you do not fear what happens in the end of nights and
have no modesty (or decency) then do what you wish.

فَلَا وَاللهِ مَا فِي الْعَيْشِ خَيْرٌ وَلَا الدُّنْيَا إِذَا ذَهَبَ الْحَيَاءُ

By Allāh, there is no good in the world and in the worldly life if modesty is gone.

يَعِيشُ الْمَرْءُ مَا اسْتَحْيَى بِخَيْرٍ وَيَبْقَى الْعُودُ مَا بَقِيَ اللِّحَاءُ

Man lives only as long as he lives fairly and decently,
and a tree lasts only as long as its bark lasts.

CHAPTER XVII

Explanation of the Qur'ānic verse:
"If they repent, offer prayers and pay the poor-dues, then let them off."

بَابٌ 17 فَإِنْ تَابُوا وَأَقَامُوا الصَّلٰوةَ
وَآتَوُا الزَّكٰوةَ فَخَلُّوا سَبِيلَهُمْ

24. We have been told by 'Abdullāh bin Muḥammad al-Musnadī who said that he was informed by Abū Rauḥ al-Ḥaramī bin 'Umārah who said: Shu'bah told us via Wāqid bin Muḥammad: I heard my father narrating the following on the authority of:

✶ Ibn 'Umar saying: Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: I have been commanded (by Allāh) to fight the people until they bear witness that there is no god but Allāh and Muḥammad (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) is the Apostle of Allāh and offer prayers and pay poor-dues. When they have done all that, their lives and properties are secured except in respect of what is due to Islam; and their reckoning is on Allāh.

24 حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ الْمُسْنَدِيُّ
قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا اَبُوْ رَوْحٍ الْحَرَمِيُّ بْنُ عُمَارَةَ قَالَ
حَدَّثَنَا شُعْبَةُ عَنْ وَّاقِدِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ قَالَ سَمِعْتُ
اَبِىْ يُحَدِّثُ عَنِ ابْنِ عُمَرَ اَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى
اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ اُمِرْتُ اَنْ اُقَاتِلَ النَّاسَ
حَتّٰى يَشْهَدُوْا اَنْ لَّآ اِلٰهَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ وَاَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا
رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ وَيُقِيْمُوا الصَّلٰوةَ وَيُؤْتُوا الزَّكٰوةَ فَاِذَا
فَعَلُوْا ذٰلِكَ عَصَمُوْا مِنِّىْ دِمَآءَهُمْ وَاَمْوَالَهُمْ
اِلَّا بِحَقِّ الْاِسْلَامِ وَحِسَابُهُمْ عَلَى اللّٰهِ ؞

The object of this *Ḥadīth* is to confirm the principle that work is part of Faith, because mere belief in Allāh and His Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is not enough, and good work like offering prayers and paying poor-dues etc is also necessary. As Faith is a combination of all necessary beliefs and good deeds, the theory of those people who hold work is not essential for Faith is falsified.

Hafiz Ibn Hajar's view regarding the above

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar 'Asqalānī says that the phrase "If they repent" mentioned in the opening line of the chapter may be explained in two ways: viz (i) This *Ḥadīth* is an explanation of the Qur'ānic verse and (ii) This chapter deals with the explanation of the verse of Qur'ān. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that three things, viz repentance, offering prayers and paying poor-dues are mentioned in the Qur'ān as well as in *Ḥadīth*. The expression "If they repent" means that if they give up disbelief and accept Islam as it has been explained by the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم), the Qur'ānic verse and the *Ḥadīth* both convey the same meaning.

Hafiz Badruddin 'Ayni's opinion

Ḥāfiẓ 'Aynī has discussed Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar's above view and said that the word "باب" "meaning chapter" itself does not need any vowel points here until we suppose that the word "هذا" "meaning this" precedes it (i.e. this is a chapter). But this supposition is not correct because Imām Bukhārī has not recorded this *Ḥadīth* for explaining the Qur'ānic verse. He has done it only for the purpose of refuting the theory of the Murji'ah sect who believe that Faith does not need work. In support of this Ḥāfiẓ 'Aynī says that it has come down from Ḥaḍrat Anas that this was the last verse of the Qur'ān in point of revelation and the above *Ḥadīth* had preceded it. It is obvious that the subsequent matter cannot be explained by what happened before.

It is well-known that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) issued orders for *Jihād* (holy war) in the early period of his mission. Anyhow, the main object of Imām Bukhārī is only to establish the doctrine that work is part of Faith, and it was the view of a section of the early Muslim scholars also.

"I have been commanded to fight the people"...... اُمِرْتُ اَنْ اُقَاتِلَ النَّاسَ
It goes without saying that this expression means that Allāh (and Allāh alone) commanded His Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) to fight the people. As an Apostle cannot be ordered by any other being than the Almighty the

nominative (Allāh) has not been mentioned here. Similarly, if a Companion says that he has been ordered to do certain thing, it will be invariably assumed that he has been ordered by no less a person than the Holy Prophet himself. In the absence of the nominative in such cases the chief officer who is entitled to issue orders will be intended.

حَتّٰى يَشْهَدُوْا اَنْ لَّآ اِلٰهَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ وَاَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ i.e., ("Until they bear witness that there is no god but Allāh and Muḥammad is Prophet of Allāh and say prayers and pay poor-dues.") When they have done all that, their lives and properties will be secured save in what is due to Islam. In other words, a Muslim must fulfil all obligations and discharge all duties that have been imposed on him by the religion of Islam. But if a Muslim commits theft or adultery or murder, etc., he will be duly punished according to Muslim law. The *Ḥadīth* ends in the expression "And their reckoning is on Allāh," i.e., in all cases one shall have to give a full account of one's activities to Allāh in the Hereafter. Of course, all Muslims are equal in respect of rights and obligations as long as they profess the religion of Islam, but the real condition of their hearts is known only to Allāh who will decide their cases as He will. The preposition '*Alā* (i.e. on) in the ***Ḥadīth*** means "to" or "for", because nothing is obligatory or compulsory for Allāh Who is undisputed Master of His will. No power on the earth or the heavens can ask Him "How and why".

Imam Ahmad and abandonment of prayers

As stated above, prayers are obligatory for all Muslims. Hence Imām Aḥmad says that whosoever does not offer prayers becomes an apostate and disbeliever. But this view is quite incorrect as the following *Ḥadīth* proves:

Allāh has enjoined five time prayers on His slaves...... and whosoever does not offer them will not have any security from Allāh. He may perish him if He so wills or forgives him if He so wishes.	خَمْسُ صَلَوٰتٍ كَتَبَهُنَّ اللّٰهُ عَلَى الْعِبَادِ اِلٰى قَوْلِهٖ وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَاْتِ بِهِنَّ فَلَيْسَ لَهٗ عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ عَهْدٌ اِنْ شَآءَ عَذَّبَهٗ وَاِنْ شَآءَ غَفَرَ لَهٗ رَوَاهُ الثَّلٰثَةُ وَاَحْمَدُ

It is hardly necessary to say that the punishment of an apostate or disbeliever is not dependent on Allāh's will, because his punishment is already prescribed by Islam, and he shall not be pardoned.

An interesting dialogue between Imam Shafi'i and Imam Ahmad

It is recorded in *Ṭabaqātul Shāfi'īyah* that Imām Shāfi'ī asked Imām Aḥmad: "Do you call one who does not say prayers an "apostate" and "disbeliever"? "Yes" was the reply. Then Imām Shāfi'ī enquired: How can he become Muslim again and what will be the nature of his repentance?" Imām Aḥmad replied that he must recite the *Kalima'i Shahādat*" (i.e., there is no god but Allāh and Muḥammad is the Prophet of Allāh). Imām Shāfi'ī said that he had heard reciting that *Kalimah* already. Imām Aḥmad replied that the man must offer prayers. But Imām Shāfi'ī retorted that no prayers of a disbeliever were acceptable. Consequently such a man has no chance of making *Taubah* (repentance) and becoming a Muslim again. It is said that Imām Aḥmad was silenced by Imām Shāfi'ī's above argument.

CHAPTER XVIII

(The argument of the person who says that Belief is work on account of the Qur'ānic verse) "And this is the garden (Paradise) which ye are made to inherit because of what ye used to do" (43:72). And several learned scholars have said in explanation of the verse "Them, by thy Lord, We shall question, every one, of what they used to do (15:92 & 93)" that "There is no god but Allāh" is intended. Again, Allāh says: "For the like of this, then, let the workers work." (37:61)

25. We have been told by Aḥmad bin Yūnus and Musā bin Ismā'īl who said that they were informed by Ibrāhīm bin Sa'd who said: "Ibn Shihāb narrated the following via Sa'īd bin Musayyab, on the authority of

✱Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah: The Holy Prophet of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) was asked "Which of work is the best?" He replied Belief in Allāh and His Apostle" "What next" he was asked. "*Jihād* in the path of Allāh" was his reply. Again some one enquired "What next" "A successful *Ḥajj*" was the Prophet's answer.

بَابٌ ۱۸ مَنْ قَالَ إِنَّ الْإِيْمَانَ هُوَ الْعَمَلُ لِقَوْلِ
اللّٰهِ تَعَالٰى وَتِلْكَ الْجَنَّةُ الَّتِيْ أُوْرِثْتُمُوْهَا بِمَا
كُنْتُمْ تَعْمَلُوْنَ وَقَالَ عِدَّةٌ مِّنْ أَهْلِ الْعِلْمِ فِيْ قَوْلِهٖ
تَعَالٰى فَوَرَبِّكَ لَنَسْئَلَنَّهُمْ أَجْمَعِيْنَ عَمَّا كَانُوْا
يَعْمَلُوْنَ عَنْ قَوْلِ لَا إِلٰهَ إِلَّا اللّٰهُ وَقَالَ لِمِثْلِ
هٰذَا فَلْيَعْمَلِ الْعَامِلُوْنَ ۞

25 - حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ يُوْنُسَ وَمُوْسَى ابْنُ
إِسْمٰعِيْلَ قَالَا حَدَّثَنَا إِبْرَاهِيْمُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ قَالَ
حَدَّثَنَا ابْنُ شِهَابٍ عَنْ سَعِيْدِ بْنِ الْمُسَيَّبِ عَنْ
أَبِيْ هُرَيْرَةَ أَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
سُئِلَ أَيُّ الْعَمَلِ أَفْضَلُ فَقَالَ إِيْمَانٌ بِاللّٰهِ
وَرَسُوْلِهٖ قِيْلَ ثُمَّ مَاذَا قَالَ الْجِهَادُ فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ قِيْلَ
ثُمَّ مَاذَا قَالَ حَجٌّ مَّبْرُوْرٌ

As repeatedly stated above, Imām Bukhārī's object is to establish the doctrine that work is an important part of Faith. Some scholars say that the fact that '*Amal* (work) is sometimes used in the sense of ***Īmān*** (Faith) proves beyond doubt that work is part of Faith. This *Ḥadīth* refutes the views of (i) the Karāmiyah who hold that mere profession of Islam is ***Īmān*** (ii) the Murji'ah who say that *Taṣdīq* (confirmation) is ***Īmān***, (iii) the *Jahmīyah* who maintain that knowledge is ***Īmān***. All these sects like to eliminate work from the fold of Faith. Imām Bukhārī's chief object is to establish that work is indispensably necessary for Faith and that knowledge, which is spontaneous and involuntary, is really no work. Such knowledge is not generally termed as work of deed.

Imam Bukhari's first argument in support of the above

In the above quoted verse:

And this is the Garden (Paradise) which ye are made to inherit because of what ye used to do. (Our'ān, 43:72)

وَتِلْكَ الْجَنَّةُ الَّتِيْ أُوْرِثْتُمُوْهَا بِمَا كُنْتُمْ
تَعْمَلُوْنَ ○ (زخرف آیت ٧٢)

It is quite evident that entry into paradise depends on good deeds. The word *Ta'malūn* "meaning what ye used to do" is emphatic on the point that work is really *Īmān*.

An objection to the word inheritance used above

Inheritance indicates that a descent gets some thing from ancestors after the latter's death. It is obvious that none can inherit a place in Paradise in the way a child inherits some property from his parents or other relatives. So this word in the Qur'ānic verse must be taken in an allegorical or figurative sense, namely, just as inherited things will always remain in the hands of the legal heirs of the ancestors and they can enjoy them in the way they desire, so also entry into Paradise will be perpetual. None after getting into Paradise will be expelled therefrom. The following verse is emphatic on the point:

There ye will have (all) that your souls desire, and there ye will have (all) for which ye pray. (Qur'ān, 41:31)

وَلَكُمْ فِيهَا مَا تَشْتَهِيٓ أَنفُسُكُمْ وَلَكُمْ فِيهَا
مَا تَدَّعُونَ ۝ (حٰمٓ السجدة، آيت ۳۱)

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is reported to have said that the people booked for Paradise will be shown those places in Hell which would have been allotted to them had they disobeyed Allāh and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). They will then express their gratitude to Allāh for His special favours and say that they would have gone astray if He had not guided them on the right path. Similarly, the people booked for Hell will be shown those places in Paradise which would have been allotted to them if they had followed the commandments of Allāh and His Apostle (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

"Allāmah 'Aynī says that *Mūrith* "who is inherited" is really the Divine Being Himself and the word has been used in an allegorical sense, i.e., as ancestors provide things to their children and dependents, so the Almighty confers favours on His dutiful and obedient slaves.

Qāḍī Nāṣīruddīn Abū Sa'īd 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar bin Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī al-Bayḍāwī says that inheritance has been compared to rewards for good work, i.e. just the inherited things remain intact after the ancestors, so also rewards for good deeds will always remain in the possession of those who will get the same.

The best explanation is that Father of Mankind, Ḥaḍrat Ādam (peace be on him) was given Paradise by Allāh, the Most Exalted, and his descendant, (who obey Allāh and His Prophets) will inherit places therein, by the grace of the Almighty as children inherit the properties of their fathers.

Imam Bukhari's second argument

Imām Bukhārī has quoted the following verse of the Qur'ān in support of his claim that *Īmān* means work and the latter stands for the former: "Them, by the Lord, We shall question, every one, of what they used to do" (Qur'ān, 15:92-93).

Many learned scholars say that *Ya'malūn* (they work) in the verse means that "there is no god but Allāh". This fact shows that *Īmān* does not consist in spontaneous knowledge only, it requires work also. Now the question is "Why does the word *Ya'malūn* in this verse mean: "There is no god but Allāh." The reply is that the pronoun in the verb *La nas 'alannahum* (We shall question them) refers to the disbelievers, as the preceding verses indicate, "Such as We send down for those who make division, those who break the Qur'ān into parts" (Qur'ān, 15:91-22).

i.e., infidels and polytheists used to divide the Qur'ān into parts sarcastically and when they heard the names of *sūrahs* of the Qur'ān they taunted and said to one another "I shall take *al-Baqarah* or *al-Mā'idah* and give you *al-'Ankabūt*, and so on. They also used to say that the Qur'ān was nothing but poetry, sorcery, fables of the people of the old or a kind of astrology, etc. Those disbelievers will be questioned about *Īmān* on the Day of Resurrection, because, according to the agreed opinion of Muslim scholars, all disbelievers were enjoined to believe in Allāh and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), though they differ as to whether the infidels are included or not among the people in general who were commanded to do good work and abstain from misdeeds. Anyhow, the main question that will be put to them in the Hereafter will be about *Īmān* (Faith).

Imam Bukhari's third argument

Imām Bukhārī has quoted the following verse of the Qur'ān to prove his case : "For the like of this, then, let the workers work" (Qur'ān, 37-61).

The preceding verse (37:60) says that it is a supreme triumph to enter Paradise. Everyone knows that *Īmān* is the first requisite for going to Paradise. Now if it is supposed that *Īmān* is something apart from work, then work alone will be enough to ensure a place in Paradise, whereas it is admitted on all hands that without *Īmān* no action can carry any weight. Thus to say "Let the workers work" is the same as to say "Let the Believers believe". The sum and substance of the last three verses of the Qur'ān is that *Īmān* is an action of heart and not mere perception of mind as the logicians say.

Imam Bukhari's fourth argument

The fourth argument in support of Bukhārī's claim is mentioned in the above *Ḥadīth* itself in which the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said in reply to the question "Which action is the best"' 'Belief in Allāh and His Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Thus it is proved that *Īmān* means work.

CHAPTER XIX

Sometimes Islam is not accepted in its true (or religious) sense. It is adopted only in a formal way or out of fear for life, as Allāh, the Most Exalted, says in the Qur'ān.

"The wandering Arabs say: We believe. Say (O Muḥammad unto them) "ye believe not, but rather say "We submit" (49:14) Real Islam is that religion which is adopted in its true sense, as the Holy Qur'ān says, "Lo! religion with Allāh is Islam (Surrender to Allāh (3:19)

26. We have been told by Abul Yamān who said that he was informed by Shu'ayb via al-Zuhrī who said: 'Āmir bin Sa'd bin Abī Waqqāṣ heard his father:

✱Sa'd bin Abī Waqqāṣ say: that the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) gave some people something while Sa'd was sitting there but the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) gave nothing to a person (Ju'ayl bin Sarāqah) and Sa'd liked him very much so he said: O Prophet of Allāh! You have given nothing to a certain person though by Allāh I know him to be a Believer. Then he (Holy Prophet) (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said "or Muslim". (Sa'd says) I kept quiet for sometime and what I knew of that man got upperhand of me and I repeated my question to the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) "Why did you not give him anything, though by Allāh I regard him to be a Believer". The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said "Or Muslim". (Sa'd says) "I kept quiet for sometime and what I knew of that person again persuaded me to repeat my question to the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa*

بَابٌ 19 إِذَا لَمْ يَكُنِ الْإِسْلَامُ عَلَى الْحَقِيْقَةِ
وَكَانَ عَلَى الْاِسْتِسْلَامِ أَوِ الْخَوْفِ مِنَ الْقَتْلِ لِقَوْلِهٖ
تَعَالٰى قَالَتِ الْأَعْرَابُ آمَنَّا قُلْ لَّمْ تُؤْمِنُوْا وَلٰكِنْ
قُوْلُوْآ أَسْلَمْنَا فَإِذَا كَانَ عَلَى الْحَقِيْقَةِ فَهُوَ عَلٰى قَوْلِهٖ
جَلَّ ذِكْرُهٗ إِنَّ الدِّيْنَ عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ الْإِسْلَامُ الْآيَةَ
26 - حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْيَمَانِ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا شُعَيْبٌ
عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنِيْ عَامِرُ بْنُ سَعْدِ بْنِ
أَبِيْ وَقَّاصٍ عَنْ سَعْدٍ أَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ أَعْطٰى رَهْطًا وَّسَعْدٌ جَالِسٌ فَتَرَكَ رَسُوْلُ
اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ رَجُلًا هُوَ أَعْجَبُهُمْ إِلَيَّ
فَقُلْتُ يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ مَا لَكَ عَنْ فُلَانٍ فَوَاللّٰهِ إِنِّيْ
لَأَرَاهُ مُؤْمِنًا فَقَالَ أَوْ مُسْلِمًا فَسَكَتُّ قَلِيْلًا ثُمَّ
غَلَبَنِيْ مَا أَعْلَمُ مِنْهُ فَعُدْتُّ لِمَقَالَتِيْ فَقُلْتُ مَا لَكَ
عَنْ فُلَانٍ فَوَاللّٰهِ إِنِّيْ لَأَرَاهُ مُؤْمِنًا فَقَالَ أَوْ
مُسْلِمًا فَسَكَتُّ قَلِيْلًا ثُمَّ غَلَبَنِيْ مَا أَعْلَمُ مِنْهُ فَعُدْتُّ
لِمَقَالَتِيْ وَعَادَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ثُمَّ
قَالَ يَا سَعْدُ إِنِّيْ لَأُعْطِي الرَّجُلَ وَغَيْرُهٗ أَحَبُّ
إِلَيَّ مِنْهُ خَشْيَةَ أَنْ يَّكُبَّهُ اللّٰهُ فِي النَّارِ رَوَاهُ يُوْنُسُ
وَصَالِحٌ وَّمَعْمَرٌ وَّابْنُ أَخِي الزُّهْرِيِّ عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ

sallam) and he repeated his words and then he said "O Sa'd I give a person something though the other person may be dearer to me. I fear lest Allāh should throw him unto fire of the hell." This *Ḥadīth* is narrated by Yūnus, Ṣāliḥ Ma'mar and a nephew of al-Zuhrī (they narrated it on the authority of al-Zuhrī).

Imam Bukhari's object and 'Allamah 'Uthmani's fourth discourse

'Allāmah 'Uthmānī says that Bukhārī's object is to prove that there are different stages and ranks of Islam and that there is increase and decrease in *Īmān* (Faith). According to 'Allamāh 'Uthmānī two points must be borne in mind in order to understand the above thoroughly. In the first place, commentators of the Qur'ān differ regarding the people referred to, in the verse" (i.e. the wandering Arabs say, "We believe"). Some of them say that the hypocrites are intended here, as these Arabs were hypocrites; but majority of well-versed commentators maintain that this verse refers to those Muslims whose *Īmān* was weak and whose hearts had not yet appreciated the beauty of Islam. They had no hypocrisy in their hearts though they were not good Muslims. The tone of the Qur'ānic verse also favours the view. It gives only a soft warning to those Muslims who had not yet embraced Islam from the core of their hearts. The language of the Qur'ān is harsh regarding hypocrites e.g. "And Allāh beareth witness that the hypocrites are speaking falsely" (63:1). The verse (*Īmān* hath not yet entered into your hearts) evidently refers to those Muslims whose *Īmān* (Faith) was weak. According to Arabic grammarians the word *lammā* (in the verse) is generally used when a certain expected thing did not happen. So the meaning of the verse will be that though the Muslims in question were not yet good Muslims, yet it was expected that *Īmān* would enter their hearts in the near future. It is obvious that no such expectation could be entertained about hypocrites. Now the question is. What is Bukhārī's view about the Qur'ānic verse under discussion? In the book *Kitābul Tafsīr* 'Allamāh 'Uthmānī says that he could not get Bukhārī's commentary on this verse (included in the *sūrah al-Ḥujrāt*). But if Ibn Kathīr or any body else says that according to Bukhārī this verse relates to the hypocrites, then this opinion will be uncertain. The best view, therefore, is that this verse was revealed about the weak-minded Muslims, and this will fit in with the context.

In the second place, *Ḥaqīqat* (real) in the *Ḥadīth* is not an antithesis of *Majāz* (allegorical or figuration) nor does it mean that thing which exactly happens. This word *Ḥaqīqat* here signifies perfection as the following *Ḥadīth* shows:

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) asked Ḥārith bin Mālik Anṣārī:

"O Ḥārithah! how did you pass your morning?" "As a true Believer" was his reply. The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said, "Look here, what do you say, everything has reality (or essence). So what is the essence of your Faith" He said: "I recognise myself through the world. I keep my nights awake and my days thirsty, as if I am seeing the throne of Allāh plainly and I also see the people of Paradise, visiting one another, and also see the people of the Hell making tumult and noise." The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said "O Ḥarithah You have recognised the reality of *Imān* and stick to it"

كَيْفَ أَصْبَحْتَ يَا حَارِثَةُ؟ قَالَ أَصْبَحْتُ
مُؤْمِنًا حَقًّا قَالَ انْظُرْ مَا تَقُوْلُ! فَإِنَّ لِكُلِّ
قَوْلٍ حَقِيْقَةً فَمَا حَقِيْقَةُ إِيْمَانِكَ؟ قَالَ عَرَفَتْ
نَفْسِيْ عَنِ الدُّنْيَا فَأَسْهَرْتُ لَيْلِيْ وَأَظْمَأْتُ نَهَارِيْ
وَكَأَنِّيْ أَنْظُرُ عَرْشَ رَبِّيْ بَارِزًا وَكَأَنِّيْ أَنْظُرُ إِلَى
أَهْلِ الْجَنَّةِ يَتَزَاوَرُوْنَ فِيْهَا وَكَأَنِّيْ أَنْظُرُ إِلَى
أَهْلِ النَّارِ يَتَضَاغَوْنَ فِيْهَا، قَالَ يَا حَارِثَةُ
عَرَفْتَ فَالْزَمْ (مجمع الزوائد ص۵۷)

Three formal ways of embracing Islam

There are three ways in which Islam is accepted in a formal way or out of fear for life, (i) A person's heart is full of enmity and hostility for Islam but he professes Islam on account of fear for life. Such a person is decidedly a hypocrite and a disbeliever of the worst type as the Holy Qur'ān says: "ان المنافقين في الدرک الا سفل من النار" "Lo! the hypocrites in the (will be) lowest deep of the Fire" (4:145),

(ii) A person does not hate or detest Islam and does not like it either. But he adopts Islam as one of so many religions by way of formality. Such a man is also a disbeliever of some kind. (iii) A person professed Islam in the beginning out of fear, but later on he realised its beauty and excellence, as a result of his experience in life leading to continuous meditation or as a result of researches in the domain of religions a man appreciated the outstanding features of Islam. These two persons are admittedly Muslim. There is a *Ḥadīth* to the effect that a Companion killed a man thinking that he did not accept Islam from his heart and he did so simply out of fear. When the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came to know of it, he said, "Did you peep into his heart?" (vide *Sharḥal Īḥyā*, page, 249-2).

On the basis of three out of four arguments stated above in explanation of the *Ḥadīth* it may be said that Imām Bukhārī meant first-mentioned kind of accepting Islam out of fear, as it is described in *Sharḥ-i-'Aqīdah* (page 368-1). It is obvious that absence of real *Īmān* means hypocrisy. The Qur'ānic verse quoted above may refer to hypocrites. The second form may also be applicable here because that is infidelity which is also hypocrisy. According to the fourth discourse of 'Allāmah 'Uthmānī, the third form, namely, a person having weak *Īmān* is meant. The meaning of "اذا لم يكن الاسلام على الحقيقة" is that a person is a Muslim but his *Īmān* is weak; and the Qur'ānic verse also refers to the Muslims of defective *Īmān*.

Explanation of the *Ḥadīth* of the Chapter

As said above, Sa'd bin Abī Waqqāṣ narrates: The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) gave some thing to some people, while I was sitting there, and gave nothing to a person whom I liked most (His name was Ju'ayl bin Sarāqah who was a distinguished Companion) The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) asked Sa'd;" "How do you find Ju'ayl". I replied "He is (as good) as other Muhajirs are". The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) then asked me".

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) asked "What do you think about Ju'ayl" I replied, as about emigrants. "What do you think about such and such a person?" I said, "He is the chief of the chiefs" (Muhajirin) The Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) then said? "If the world is filled with such chiefs, even then Ju'ayl is the best of all"

كَيْفَ تَرٰى جُعَيْلًا ؟ قُلْتُ كَشَكْلِهٖ مِنَ
النَّاسِ قَالَ كَيْفَ تَرٰى فُلَانًا ؟ قَالَ سَيِّدٌ مِّنْ
سَادَاتِ النَّاسِ (يَعْنِى الْمُهَاجِرِيْنَ) قَالَ فَجُعَيْلٌ
خَيْرٌ مِّنْ مِلْاءِ الْاَرْضِ مِنْ فُلَانٍ۔

Sa'd, thinking that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) might have not remembered, said, "فو الله انى لاراه مومنا" "By Allāh I see him a Believer". In the above *Ḥadīth* it may be explained in two ways, viz (with word (لاراه) may be in active voice meaning, 'see him'. In this case the word will be derived from (رويت) and its first letter (همزه) (i.e. الف) will have (فتح). The knowledge obtained by seeing a person personally will indicate certainty in meaning.

(ii) the word (لاراه) may be in passive voice, meaning, 'it is shown to me'. Here this word will be derived from (رای) and the first letter (همزه) (i.e. الف) will have (ضمه). The knowledge procured in this way will indicate probability in meaning, not certainty. Some scholars have preferred the first alternative, as it is preceded by *Wallāh* (meaning by Allāh), and oath is used for certainty, not probability. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) repeatedly asked Sa'd whether he regarded Ju'ayl as (مومن) (Believer) or (مسلم) (Muslim).

Again, there are different views regarding the letter (و) between the two words (مومناً) and (مسلماً) Ḥāfiẓ Badruddīn 'Aynī says that the first letter (همزه is استفهامیه) (interrogative letter) and the letter (و) is (حرف عطف) (letter of conjunction). But this view is not correct according to Arabic grammar, because (مسلم) and (مومن) both should have (ضمه) while (فتحه) is needed in such a case. This interpretation is acceptable according to Imām Muslim's narration of the above *Ḥadīth* (through our chain of transmitters) in the following words: ”فقلت یا رسول الله اعط فلاناً فانه مؤمن فقال النبی صلى الله علیه وسلم او مسلم“ (I said; O Prophet of Allāh give some thing to such and such person because he is (مومن) (Believer) and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said or (مسلم) (Muslim). Ḥāfiẓ 'Aynī says the Holy Prophet's saying meant that he (Ju'ayl bin Sarāqah) was Muslim certainly but about his *Īmān* the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not like to say any thing definitely. Anyhow, the sum and substance of the above discourse is that *Īmān* is located in heart and Islam is a declaration with tongue of what is found in heart. Hence we can announce with certainty about the external condition of a person and can say whether he is Muslim or not. But we cannot peep into the mind of any man and say definitely that his *Īmān* is strong or weak.

CHAPTER XX

To say *salām* (greeting) is enjoined by Islam.

'Ammār said: Whosoever has accumulated three things has accumulated *Imān*:

To do justice to one self, to *salām* every person (Muslim) and to spend even in adversity.

27. We have been told by Qutaybah who said that he was informed by Layth via Yazīd bin Abī Ḥabīb via Abil Khayr on the authority of:

✶'Abdullāh bin 'Amr bin al-'Āṣ that a person asked the Prophet of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) "What kind of Islam is the best." He said, 'You feed the people, and *salām* the person whom you know or whom you do not know."

بَابٌ 20 إِفْشَاءُ السَّلَامِ مِنَ الْإِسْلَامِ وَقَالَ
عَمَّارٌ ثَلٰثٌ مَنْ جَمَعَهُنَّ فَقَدْ جَمَعَ الْإِيْمَانَ
الْإِنْصَافُ مِنْ نَفْسِكَ وَبَذْلُ السَّلَامِ لِلْعَالَمِ
وَالْإِنْفَاقُ مِنَ الْإِقْتَارِ -
27 - حَدَّثَنَا قُتَيْبَةُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا اللَّيْثُ عَنْ
يَزِيْدَ بْنِ أَبِيْ حَبِيْبٍ عَنْ أَبِي الْخَيْرِ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ
بْنِ عَمْرٍو أَنَّ رَجُلًا سَأَلَ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ أَيُّ الْإِسْلَامِ خَيْرٌ قَالَ تُطْعِمُ الطَّعَامَ
وَتَقْرَءُ السَّلَامَ عَلٰى مَنْ عَرَفْتَ وَمَنْ لَّمْ تَعْرِفْ -

Publicity and flourishing of Islam

Imām Bukhārī means to say that the frequent use of *salām* among Muslims is a sign of an ideal (or real) Islam. Islam is the most natural, rational and civilized religion of the world and teaches us the rules and regulations that are essential for a decent and cultured life both individually and collectively. For generating the feelings of sympathy, tolerance, cooperation and affection among various classes of people the practice of making *salām* (greeting) is exceedingly useful. The word *Salām* means peace and safety, and this is the best form of greetings which a man can use. When two Muslims meet—young and old, rich and poor, known or unknown—both of them are inclined to each other as soon as one *salāms* the other, and the addressee returns it in the similar or better form. The Holy Qur'ān says:

When ye are greeted with a greeting,
greet ye with better than it or return it.
(Qur'ān, 4:86)

وَإِذَا حُيِّيتُم بِتَحِيَّةٍ فَحَيُّوا بِأَحْسَنَ
مِنْهَا أَوْ رُدُّوهَا ؕ (النساء، آیت ٨٦)۔

In the preceding verse intercessions for good and bad work have been mentioned together with their consequences. In this verse Allāh, the Most Exalted, says that if a person gives any one greetings *salām* or good wishes *Du'ā* he must return them in the same or better terms. For example, if a person tells me *al-Salām 'Alaykum* (i.e. peace be on you) I must say *wa 'Alaykum al-Salām* (On you peace be). If I need more *Thawāb* (reward), I must add *wa Raḥmatullāh* (and grace of Allāh). If he has used these words, I should say *wa Barakātuhū* (and blessings of Allāh).

It should be noted that one should *salām* another in an audible tone so that the addressee may be able to respond. To begin *salām* is a *sunnat* and to give its reply is *wājib* (obligatory). The person who begins *salām* will get more *thawāb* (reward) than the man who responds to it, though the former has done a work which is *sunnat* and the latter *wājib*. This is really an exception to the general rule of Islamic law, for example, if a person spends one rupee in *Zakāt* (which is obligatory for every Muslim who can afford it) he will get much higher reward than if he paid thousands of rupees (on *Nafil* which is not obligatory). Because the former is obligatory and the latter voluntary. Reward for the obligatory prayers is much more than the optional prayers. But, as said above, *salāming* is an exception to the above general rule. Similarly, to make ablution before the commencement of the time of prayer is only voluntary, but it will bring more reward than that ablution which is made thereafter (though it is obligatory).

The first point in Hadrat 'Ammar's discourse

Haḍrat 'Ammār says that whosoever has accumulated three things (see above) has procured *Īmān* (Faith). The first point is (justice to oneself). The word "من" "i.e. from" in this expression may convey the idea of commencement. Its meaning will be "to do justice sincerely and from the core of heart without fear or favour and without hypocrisy or flattery or praise. The word (من) here may stand for (فی) (i.e. in) and then the meaning of the sentence will be "to do justice to oneself". As it is easier to do justice in respect of others than in respect of oneself, it is assumed that one who is very particular in dealing justly to oneself will do it all the more regarding others. The Holy Qur'ān says:

O ye who believe! Be ye staunch in
justice, witnesses for Allāh, even though
it be against yourselves or your parents or
(your) kindred. (Qur'ān, 4:135)

يَٰٓأَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُونُوا قَوَّامِينَ بِالْقِسْطِ
شُهَدَآءَ لِلَّهِ وَلَوْ عَلَىٰٓ أَنفُسِكُمْ أَوِ الْوَالِدَيْنِ
وَالْأَقْرَبِينَ ۚ (النساء، آیت ١٣٥)

Thus justice must be done even though one suffers or one's parents and relatives suffer.

In another place the Qur'ān says:

And let not hatred of any people
seduce you that ye deal not justly. Deal
justly, that is nearer to your duty.
(Qur'ān, 5:8)

وَلَا يَجْرِمَنَّكُمْ شَنَآنُ قَوْمٍ عَلَىٰٓ أَلَّا
تَعْدِلُوا ۚ اعْدِلُوا هُوَ أَقْرَبُ لِلتَّقْوَىٰ (المائدہ آیت ٨)

The second point

"بذل السلام للعالم" means to spread *salām* throughout the world. The idea is that one should *salām* the people freely and frequently—may they be known or unknown, countrymen or foreigners, relatives or strangers.

As said earlier, one must *salām* (greet) in an audible voice, so that the addressee may respond. The prescribed form of *Salām*, according to the *Sunnat-i-Rasūl*, is that one should say (السلام علیکم) (peace be on you) without moving hand. If one adds (رحمة الله وبرکاته ومغفرته) (mercy of Allāh, His blessings and His forgiveness) one will get rewards for ten good deeds. It is, however, against *sunnat* to say or write (سلام مسنون) instead of (السلام علیکم).

There is a *Ḥadīth* in Tirmidhī to the effect that a certain companion addressed the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) as "علیک السلام یا رسول الله" (i.e. To you *Salām* O Prophet of Allāh.) The Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said, "This sort of *salām* and greeting suits dead persons. You should say (السلام علیکم) (peace on you) to one another." The commentators of *Aḥādīth* say that what the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) has said above is the best and most perfect form of *salām*, otherwise he did not mean that his *salām* would not be recognised as *salām*: One can move hands also at the time of saying (وعلیکم السلام) (on you *salām*) but the moving of hand only is not the proper form of *Salām* (وعلیکم السلام) must follow (السلام علیکم) immediately, otherwise delay makes a person sinful on account of ignoring what is obligatory. If two persons meet again after some temporary separation, they must *salām* each other again.

The third point

Ḥaḍrat 'Ammār's third point is "الا نفاق من الا قتار" (i.e. to spend despite poverty). The word (من) (i.e. from) here may stand for (فی) (in) or "عند" "near" or "مع" "with" and the idea is the same, namely, to spend in the path of Allāh even when one's financial condition is straitened. The Holy Qur'ān says:

> And he whose provision is measured, let him spend of that which Allāh hath given him. (Qur'ān, 65:7)

> وَمَنْ قُدِرَ عَلَيْهِ رِزْقُهٗ فَلْيُنْفِقْ مِمَّآ اٰتٰىهُ اللّٰهُ ۚ (الطلاق آیت ۷)

Hadrat 'Ammar and Hafiz 'Ayni

Ḥāfiẓ 'Allāmah Badruddīn 'Aynī says that the words of 'Ammār have accumulated all characteristics of *Īmān* (Faith). These characteristics will be either physical or financial. The former is of two kinds (i) one is related to the Creator and (ii) the other to the created beings. In the expression "الانفاق من الا قتار" "to spend despite poverty" the pecuniary aspect of *Īmān* has been described, because that person only will spend in the path of Allāh who has full confidence in Him and who regards such expenditure as a means of salvation and blessings. In the phrase "الانصاف من نفسک" "to deal justice to oneself" the importance of Allāh's commandments has been mentioned, whereas in "افشاء السلام" "to spread *salām*" the necessity of meeting out brotherly treatments to the created beings has been described in order to generate love and affection among them.

Why did Imam Bukhari repeat one *Ḥadīth*

Imām Bukhārī generally does not describe any *Ḥadīth* twice. But he did it here for some reasons. He made mention of the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter in "اطعام الطعام من الاسلام" "to feed some persons is part of Islam" which his teacher Shaykh 'Amr bin Khālid had narrated on the authority of Layth; whereas the Imām's another teacher Shaykh Qutaybah has transmitted the said *Ḥadīth* on the authority of Layth.

The Imām wants to emphasize the point and prove two different things (viz. to feed the people and to spread *salām*) by the same *Ḥadīth*, and so he has given two separate chapters for the same.

The Imam's special merits of reasoning

Some scholars of *Ḥadīth* have arranged *Aḥādīth* according to the chapters of Islamic Jurisprudence *(Fiqh)* and could not look into the various problems of life. One of Bukhārī's great merits is that he tried to trace the social condition of the people of his time through different *Aḥādīth* and draw appropriate conclusions from the available premises and describe them under separate heads. For example Imām Muslim has recorded a *Ḥadīth* in the chapter of *Alms* "باب الصدقة" to the effect that a certain person gave Burayrah, a maid-servant of Ḥaḍrat 'Ā'ishah (رضی الله عنها) a piece of meat by way of Ṣadaqah (alms). Ḥaḍrat 'Ā'ishah did not give it to the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) as she knew that he never ate a thing of alms. But the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said that if she gave that meat to him he would accept it as it would be a gift to him though it was Ṣadaqah for her. From the *Ḥadīth*, Bukhārī has drawn several conclusions which he has described under different chapters. For example, the Imām has argued by the *Ḥadīth* that if a person is given alms, and he presents it to another person for whom alms is unlawful, then it is permissible for him to accept it. The Imām has also inferred from the *Ḥadīth* that it is lawful to give alms to the "servants" of those persons for whom it is unlawful to accept the same, as the maid servant of Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah took alms but he did not forbid it.

The Imām al-Muḥaddithīn Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl has some special merits on account of which his book is entitled "The most correct book after the Book of Allāh." Though the Imām aims at the compilation of correct *Aḥādith*, its outstanding feature is that in his arrangement of *Aḥādīth* he has taken into account the necessary problems of Islamic jurisprudence (Fiqh), and quoted the verses of the Qur'ān in support of the lawfulness and unlawfulness of certain deeds and also narrated *Aḥādīth*, if available. In *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* fluency of language and beauty of expression are incomparable. The Imām tried to follow that language which was in vogue during the Holy Prophet's time or his nearest successors. He was very careful about the words as well as the substance of *Aḥādīth*.

CHAPTER XXI

Ungratefulness to husband is one sort of *kufr* (infidelity). One kind of *kufr* is less than another. Abū Sa'id narrated it from the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).

28. We have been told by 'Abdullāh bin Maslamah via Mālik via Zayd bin Aslam via 'Aṭā' son of Yasār, via:

✱ Ibn 'Abbās who said: The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said (in course of a long *Ḥadīth*): "I was shown the Hell where I saw that majority of its dwellers were women as they committed disbelief." The people asked him whether they disbelieved in Allāh?" He replied: "No, they are ungrateful to their husbands and do not acknowledge the kindness shown to them. If you confer favours on a woman for whole life, but if she dislikes any thing which you may have done, then she will tell you: "I did not find any good in you".

بَابٌ 21 كُفْرَانِ الْعَشِيْرِ وَكُفْرٌ
دُوْنَ كُفْرٍ فِيْهِ عَنْ اَبِيْ سَعِيْدٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

28- حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ مَسْلَمَةَ عَنْ مَالِكٍ
عَنْ زَيْدِ بْنِ اَسْلَمَ عَنْ عَطَاءِ بْنِ يَسَارٍ عَنِ ابْنِ
عَبَّاسٍ قَالَ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اُرِيْتُ
النَّارَ فَاِذَا اَكْثَرُ اَهْلِهَا النِّسَاءُ يَكْفُرْنَ قِيْلَ
اَيَكْفُرْنَ بِاللّٰهِ قَالَ يَكْفُرْنَ الْعَشِيْرَ وَيَكْفُرْنَ
الْاِحْسَانَ لَوْ اَحْسَنْتَ اِلٰى اِحْدٰهُنَّ الدَّهْرَ
ثُمَّ رَاَتْ مِنْكَ شَيْئًا قَالَتْ مَا رَاَيْتُ مِنْكَ
خَيْرًا قَطُّ ۞

The word '*Ashīr* means companion and associate but here it means husband. In this *Ḥadīth* ingratitude of woman is emphasised. Imām Bukhārī has divided this *Ḥadīth* into two parts. *Kufr dūna kufr* means that one kind of disbelief is less than another kind of disbelief. Bukhārī wants to prove two things :

(i) There is doubt of increase and decrease in disbelief, and as a corollary its antithesis i.e. belief will also have doubt of increase and decrease. As *kufr* (disbelief) has various degrees so also *Īmān* (belief) has. Doubts in any thing create doubts in its opposite. If any thing decreases one degree, its opposite will have corresponding increase of one degree. There is a well-known maxim i.e. Indeed, things are known by their opposites.

(ii) Sins are included in disbelief (it will be discussed in the next chapter) and so good deed will be included in belief. In this way relevancy between the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter and the *Kitāb al-Īmān* has been made clear.

Now scholars differ as to whether Imām Bukhārī used the expression *kufr dūna kufr* (i.e. one kind of disbelief is less than another kind of disbelief) or some body else. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar and some other commentators say that 'Aṭā' bin Abī Ribāḥ said the above. Late Mawlānā Anwar Shāh Ṣāḥīb held the same view, but he added that originally Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās used the above expression and 'Aṭā' being his pupil probably recorded it as Ibn Kathīr narrated it from Ibn 'Abbās in connection with the following verse: "ومن لم يحكم بما انزل الله فاولئک هم الكافرون" "And whoso judgeth not by that which Allāh hath revealed: such are disbelievers" (Qur'ān, 5:44).

Afterwards late Mawlānā Ṣāḥib says that Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar was perhaps unaware of the fact that Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās used the above expression, otherwise he would have ascribed it to him. Saying of Ibn 'Abbās relates to the above-quoted verse of the Holy Qur'ān.

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكُمْ بِمَآ اَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ
فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْكٰفِرُوْنَ (مائدہ آیت ۴۴)

And whoso Judgeth not by that which Allāh hath revealed: such are disbelievers". (Qur'ān, 5:44)

There is one objection here—The Qur'ānic verse refers to the abandonment of our obligatory duty of Islam and it is evident that one who fails to discharge one's duty does not become disbeliever. To meet this objection some scholars say that the persons whose conviction is that obligatory duties of Islam are not really binding on Muslims, are disbelievers. This view seems to be far-fetched. Some people say that this verse relates to the Jews. Ibn Kathīr noted down the following words of Ibn 'Abbās in connection with the above verse "This is that kind of *kufr* on account of which a Muslim does not cease to be Muslim". From the above, it is quite evident that *kufr* may be big or small. As a result of the former a man gets out of the camp of Muslims but in the latter case he does not. Thus 'Aṭā' bin Abī Ribāḥ has concluded the expression *kufrun dūna kufrin* from the above discourse.

Ibn 'Abbās is also reported to have said in connection with the above verse. "This is a kind of *kufr*, but this is not like *kufr* (or disbelief) in Allāh and His angels and His Prophets (which renders one a disbeliever). In other words, this sort of work is a branch of *kufr*, and *kufrun dūna kufrin* (one kind of *kufr* is less than another kind of *kufr*) is based on the saying of Ibn 'Abbās, though it is not actually said by him. For this reason Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib ascribed these words to 'Aṭā' bin Abī Ribāḥ and not to Ibn 'Abbās.

It is not correct to say that Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib was not informed of the saying of Ibn 'Abbās because it was he who referred to the saying of Ibn 'Abbās in the next chapter on "ظلم دون ظلم" "cruelty below cruelty". Again 'Aṭā' bin Abī Ribāḥ has related three sentences viz (i) disbelief below disbelief (ii) Cruelty below cruelty and (iii) hypocrisy below hypocrisy. From this discourse several problems relating to sins and disbelief are solved. For example:

Whoso abandons prayers is an infidel (*Ḥadīth*)	مَنْ تَرَكَ الصَّلٰوةَ فَقَدْ كَفَرَ
Two things are found among the people which are infidelity viz : (i) taunting any person on the basis of his parentage and. (ii) lamenting the dead. (*Ḥadīth*)	اِثْنَتَانِ فِى النَّاسِ هُمَا بِهِمْ كُفْرٌ اَلطَّعْنُ فِى الْاَنْسَابِ وَالنِّيَاحَةُ
To abuse a Muslim is a sin and to fight with him is infidelity. (*Ḥadīth*)	سِبَابُ الْمُسْلِمِ فُسُوْقٌ وَّقِتَالُهٗ كُفْرٌ

In the light of the above it is unnecessary to interpret the words of *Aḥādīth* in an allegorical or figurative sense. We should take them in their real meaning without any hesitation. So the meaning of the above *Aḥādīth* is that all those acts referred to, are matters of disbelief, but when *kufr* admits of doubt. This doubt must be found in the meaning of *kufr* also. Consequently, all those *Aḥādīth* which declare that a certain sin makes a man disbeliever must be taken in their original meaning without making any *tāwīl* or adopting a secondary meaning. For example, "When a person commits adultery he does not remain a Muslim at the time of committing adultery. (*Ḥadīth*) "He has no belief who commits treachery." (*Ḥadīth*)

"كفر دون كفر" (Disbelief below disbelief)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyah and Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Qayyam have explained this point in detail. The sum and substance of their discourse is that belief and disbelief are contrary terms from the religious point of view, i.e., if one of the two disappears, the other takes its place. As stated before, belief has various branches (they may be parts or related matters of belief), some of which are high and others are low, some branches are nearer to the high and others are nearer to the low than the rest. For example. "اعلاها شهادة ان لا اله الا الله وادناها اماطة الاذى" "The highest branch of *Īmān* (Belief) is to bear witness that there is no god but Allāh and the lowest is to remove troublesome things".

As a rule decrease in our branch of belief will produce increase in the corresponding branch of disbelief, e.g., absence of *Shahādat* (i.e. bearing witness that there is no god but Allāh) means disbelief in Allāh. Similarly, if modesty which is part of belief, disappears, shamelessness which is part of disbelief will occupy its place. This is called "*kufrun dūna kufrin*". (One branch of disbelief is lesser than another branch of disbelief). Some branches of disbelief are very high (and they are like roots), which render a person non-Muslim, e.g. disbelief in Allāh, His angels and his Apostles. Some branches of disbelief are low (and they are like leaves, flowers etc.) which do not make a person non-Muslim and which are not equal to disbelief in Allāh, His angels and His Prophets—though they are branches of disbelief.

Īmān (belief) and *kufr* (disbelief) are just like light and darkness, as the Holy Qur'ān says:

> Allāh is the Protecting Friend of those who believe. He bringeth them out of darkness into light. As for those who disbelieve, their patrons are false deities. They bring them out of light into darkness.
> (Qur'ān, 2:257)

> اَللّٰهُ وَلِیُّ الَّذِیْنَ اٰمَنُوْا یُخْرِجُهُمْ مِّنَ
> الظُّلُمٰتِ اِلَی النُّوْرِ وَالَّذِیْنَ کَفَرُوْٓا اَوْلِیٰٓؤُهُمُ
> الطَّاغُوْتُ یُخْرِجُوْنَهُمْ مِّنَ النُّوْرِ اِلَی الظُّلُمٰتِ
> (بقره، آیت ۲۵۷)

Sometimes there is light only as at the day time and sometimes there is darkness only as at night. Sometimes there is a mixture of light and darkness as during the time of Subḥi Ṣādiq (early morning) until sun rises. Now the question is "under what category is mixture of light and darkness included?" Some scholars say that it is part of day, and others say that it is part of night. However, correct view is that it is neither included in day nor night. It is a transitional period in which light of day and darkness of night meet together. Some lexicographers favour this view, and the religion of Islam takes both of them (light of day and darkness of night) into account. For example, in prayers, at day time, verses of the Qur'ān are read secretly and at night time loudly. But in morning prayers also they are read loudly, which shows that darkness of night is taken into account. In respect of Fast, the light of day is considered, because, it is observed at day time. It is the grace and wisdom of the Almighty that He has combined opposite things, viz. light and darkness at the same time, i.e. in one respect it is light and in another darkness. Similarly, belief and disbelief meet sometimes in the same place. A Muslim sometimes has some aspects of disbelief like pride, abandonment of prayer, (shamelessness etc.) and these are branches of disbelief.

The elements of belief in a disbeliever

Some disbelievers have a few elements of belief also, such as modesty, meekness, etc. The Holy Prophet of Islam is reported to have said to Ashaj 'Abdul Qays "Verily, you have two qualities which Allāh loves, viz. forbearance and humility. He asked the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) "Have those qualities been generated in me by Islam or had they been in me before I accepted the religion?" The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) replied "you have those merits by birth." Just as belief consists of a series of elements (or branches), some of which are high, some are low and others are in mediocre, so also disbelief is a combination of a large number of elements (or branches) some of which are high, some are low and others are moderate. This accounts for the expression "*kufrun dūna kufrin*" (some kinds of disbelief are lower than other kinds of disbelief). Some kinds of disbelief eliminate belief altogether, as dark night removes light, whereas some kinds of disbelief co-exist with belief, as light and darkness meet during the early morning before sunrise. According to majority of Muslim scholars, the word "*kufr*" (disbelief) used in the following (and similar) *Aḥādīth* mean that kind of *kufr* which can co-exist with belief:

"من ترک الصلوة فقد کفر" "Whoever has abandoned prayers is an unbeliever" "خصلتان هما بهم کفر الخ" "Two qualities are elements of infidelity with them" "قتاله کفر ونحوه" "To fight with Muslims is infidelity".

No disbeliever can be called a Muslim for having certain qualities of a Muslim

An objection may be raised here that when a man cannot be expelled from Muslim community on account of having some qualities of *kufr*, a disbeliever who has some merits of belief should be called a Muslim. This objection is not tenable; because *Īmān* (belief) and *kufr* (disbelief) are respectively like health and disease. It is obvious that a healthy person may be called sick if he has one or two diseases, but the very sick man cannot be regarded healthy if he has one or two signs of health. Unless the root of disease is removed a person remains ill.

In short, all virtues are elements (or branches) of *Īmān* and all vices are elements (or branches) of *Kufr*. This point may be explained in this way also. *Īmān* means *Taṣdīq* (confirmation). Now, if it is by heart it is called *'Aqīdah* (conviction), if it is by tongue it is called *Iqrār* (confession), and if it is by other parts of body, it is called *'Amal* (work). Some time *'Amal* also stands for *Taṣdīq* as the following *Ḥadīth* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) indicates:

And the private parts of a person confirm or reject it.

وَالْفَرْجُ يُصَدِّقُ ذَالِكَ وَيُكَذِّبُهُ

The following opinion of Ḥasan Baṣarī is recorded in *Sharḥil 'Aqīdatil Ṭaḥāwīyah*.

Belief does not consist in decoration or ambition, but in that which goes deep into our hearts and is confirmed by good deeds.

لَيْسَ الْإِيْمَانُ بِالتَّحَلِّيْ وَلَا بِالتَّمَنِّيْ وَ
لٰكِنَّ الْإِيْمَانَ مَا وَقَرَ فِي الصُّدُوْرِ وَصَدَّقَتْهُ
الْأَعْمَالُ

This passage shows that *Taṣdīq*, i.e. approval (or confirmation) applies to our work also. Thus *Taṣdīq* has three stages. As long as it is in one's heart, it is named *'Aqīdah* by heart, when it is expressed by tongue it is called confession by tongue and when it is translated into action it is named *'Amal* (work). As *Taṣdīq* passes through three stages so also does *Īmān*.

Stages of *Īmān* and *kufr*

Īmān (belief) is one thing, but it has three stages which are not similar in position (or degree). If *Īmān* disappears from one stage, it will be occupied by its opposite, viz. *kufr*. For example, if a person's heart is devoid of *Īmān* and *Taṣdīq*, disbelief and rejection will enter his heart and he will become staunch *kāfir* (disbeliever), because confirmation by heart is the root of *Īmān* on which other things depend. If a man's heart believes but his tongue does not confess it, then his tongue will be deprived of *Īmān*. Opinions differ as to whether he will be a Muslim or non-Muslim. Similarly, if a person does no good work, his body will be deprived of *Īmān*—this is also a kind of *kufr* (a partial *kufr*) but this will not eliminate *Īmān* altogether. In short, wherever the word *kufr* is used in *Aḥādīth* regarding *'amal*, it must be taken in its original meaning. As *Īmān* has various stages so also *kufr* has. As said earlier, "*kufr* is below *kufr*". A defective (or partial) *kufr* does not eliminate *Īmān*. The term *kufr* used by the Founder of the religion of Islam should be taken in its real meaning and there is no need of interpreting it in an allegorical sense. As a result of this discourse based on researches, several objections regarding the use of *kufr* in the Qur'ān and *Aḥādīth* for misdeeds or neglecting some religious duty have been removed.

Ẓulmun dūna Ẓulmin

"One kind of wrong-doing is below another wrong-doing". The Holy Qur'ān has used the word *Ẓulm* in several meanings as under:

And the disbelievers, they are the wrong-doers. (Qur'ān, 2:254)
وَالْكٰفِرُوْنَ هُمُ الظّٰلِمُوْنَ (البقرہ آیت ۲۵۴)

This verse shows that a wrong-doer is a *kāfir* (disbeliever) and wrong-doing is *kufr* (disbelief). This very word (i.e, *Ẓulm*) has been used in the Qur'ān for Believers, nay for Prophets also, as the following prayer of Prophet Ḥaḍrat Yūnus (Jonah) (may peace be on him) indicates:

There is no god save Thee. Be Thou glorified! Lo! I have been a wrong-doer. (Qur'ān, 21:87)
لَآ اِلٰهَ اِلَّآ اَنْتَ سُبْحٰنَكَ اِنِّيْ كُنْتُ مِنَ الظّٰلِمِيْنَ

Ḥaḍrat Ādam (may peace be on him) prayed in these words:

Our Lord! We have wronged ourselves. (Qur'ān, 7:23)
رَبَّنَا ظَلَمْنَآ اَنْفُسَنَا (اعراف آیت ۲۳)

The word *Ẓulm* in the phrase *Ẓulmun dūna Ẓulmin*, means to put a thing in a place other than that which is meant for it. It has many stages, i.e. from what is inadvisable to atheism (godlessness).

Shirk dūna Shirk

One kind of polytheism is below another kind of polytheism. The Holy Qur'ān says:

And whoso ascribeth partners unto Allāh, it is as if he had fallen from the sky and the birds had snatched him[1]. (Qur'ān, 22:31)
مَنْ يُّشْرِكْ بِاللّٰهِ فَكَاَنَّمَا خَرَّ مِنَ السَّمَآءِ
فَتَخْطَفُهُ الطَّيْرُ (الحج، آیت ۳۱)

Another verse puts it.

Lo! Allāh pardoneth not that partners should be ascribed unto Him and He pardoneth all save that to whom He will. (Qur'ān, 4:116)
اِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ اَنْ يُّشْرَكَ بِهٖ وَيَغْفِرُ
مَا دُوْنَ ذٰلِكَ لِمَنْ يَّشَآءُ (نساء، آیت ۱۱۶)

This sort of *shirk* (polytheism) is a plain and open *shirk*. Hypocrisy and exhibition of righteous work are included in secret *shirk*. The Holy Qur'ān says:

So whoever hopeth for the meeting with his Lord, let him do righteous work, and make none sharer of the worship due unto his Lord. (Qur'ān, 18:110)
فَمَنْ كَانَ يَرْجُوْا لِقَآءَ رَبِّهٖ فَلْيَعْمَلْ عَمَلًا
صَالِحًا وَّلَا يُشْرِكْ بِعِبَادَةِ رَبِّهٖٓ اَحَدًا (کہف آیت ۱۱۰)

Similarly another verse declares.

So when He gave unto them a healthy child, they ascribed unto Him partners in respect of that which He had given them. (Qur'ān, 7:190)
فَلَمَّآ اٰتٰهُمَا صَالِحًا جَعَلَا لَهٗ شُرَكَآءَ
فِيْمَآ اٰتٰهُمَا (الاعراف، آیت ۱۹۰)

In the above verses *shirk* is so called because of its literal meaning (according to one of the two commentaries of the Qur'ān), but it is not an antithesis of *Īmān* (belief). The two can co-exist. *Shirk* in the phrase *Shirk dūna shirk* means to ascribe a partner to Allāh in any form or method, as it has innumerable stages and degrees.

---

[1] *Tauḥīd* (oneness of Allāh) is the highest rank of *Īmān*. Now a man leaving worship of Allāh prostrates before any created being he really makes himself fall from the sky. Obviously, such person cannot live long. Hence birds will snatch his flesh and the wind will blow him to a far off place. Abdur Raḥmān

Nifāq dūna Nifāq

One kind of hypocrisy is below another kind of hypocrisy. The Holy Qur'ān says:

Lo! the hypocrites are in the lowest deep of the fire. (Qur'ān, 4:145)

إِنَّ الْمُنٰفِقِيْنَ فِى الدَّرْكِ الْأَسْفَلِ مِنَ النَّارِ (نساء آيت ١٤٥)

Furthermore, it is recorded on reliable *Aḥādīth* that whosoever possesses the following characteristics will be a staunch (or pure) hypocrite viz (i) To commit breach of trust, to speak lies, to violate pledges (or agreements) and to quarrel with the people using vulgarism and unmannerliness. If a person has one of the above, he will have one element of hypocrisy. The above characteristics relate to work, not to *Īmān*. Hence they can be found in a Muslim also. In this way the above phrase *Nifāq dūna Nifāq* has been explained.

Kufr, *Ẓulm* **and** *Nifāq*

Kufr (disbelief) *Ẓulm* (wrong-doing) and *nifāq* have many different stages and ranks, and their effects will also vary according to the nature of the above. But it cannot be gainsaid that the application of the above to a sinful person must be taken in its real sense, because the application of a general rule to all persons is reasonable, may they be perfect and strong or defective and weak. The reader should ponder and think, as the discourse is excellent.

The meaning of *Dūna*

Now what is the meaning of the word *Dūna* here and what is Imām Bukhārī's opinion? This word has two meanings (i) dissimilar and other (ii) nearer and lower. According to dictionary the second meaning seems to be correct. Imām Rāghib observes that *dūna* means a thing of low rank. Hence some lexicographers say that *dūna* is derived from *dunuwun* meaning nearness. So this word originally meant lower and nearer and afterwards other and dissimilar. Now if the word *dūna* in the phrase *kufr dūna kufr* means other and dissimilar, then the meaning of the above will be that *kufr* has various kinds, some of which expel a person from the religion of Islam, i.e. disbelief in Allāh and His Prophets., etc, and other kinds do not, e.g. abandonment of prayers and ingratitude of relatives. Some kinds of *kufr* are lesser in degree than others.

Imām Rāghib says the same thing in explanation of the Qur'ānic verse: "Lo! Allāh pardoneth not that partners should be ascribed unto Him. He pardoneth all save that to whom He will". (Qur'ān, 4:116)

Anyhow, it is obvious that the word *dūna* means nearer and lower, i.e., it is lower than clear polytheism; and Allāh pardons all sins of smaller degrees but does not pardon polytheism. Shāh 'Abdul Qādir has translated the word *dūna* into beyond. Now if *dūna* in the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter means dissimilar or something else, then Imām Bukhārī's object will be to relate different ranks and degrees thereof as there are various ranks of *Īmān* according to increase or decrease. Thus to prove the different kinds of *kufr* or different ranks thereof is the objective. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar takes *dūna* in the sense of nearer and lower and says that Bukhārī's purpose is to prove various ranks of *kufr*. In other words, when the author has established his doctrine that *Īmān* and Islam have various ranks based on increase and decrease, then it is clear that its antithesis, viz. *kufr* has different ranks, because "things are known by their opposites," as detailed above. Mawlānā Anwar Shāh Ṣāḥib gives preference to the view that the word *dūna* here means dissimilar or other and gives some arguments in support thereof, including the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter. But in order to appreciate Shāh Ṣāḥib's view one point must be understood first.

Difference between *kufr* and *kufrān*

The two words *kufr* and *kufrān* are maṣdar (Infinitive) of "كفر يكفر" which means to conceal something. A cultivator is called *Kāfir* in '*Arabia* because he conceals seed inside the earth, night is so called because it darkens the atmosphere, and ungratefulness is also a kind of *kufr*, as the Holy Qur'ān says:

If ye give thanks, I will give you more; but if ye are thankless, lo! my punishment is dire. (Qur'ān, 14:7)

لَئِنْ شَكَرْتُمْ لَأَزِيدَنَّكُمْ وَلَئِنْ كَفَرْتُمْ
إِنَّ عَذَابِي لَشَدِيدٌ ○ (ابراہیم آیت ٧)

Qur'ān has again said:

This is of the bounty of my Lord, that He may try me whether I give thanks or am ungrateful. Whosoever giveth thanks he only giveth thanks for (the good of) his own soul. (Qur'ān, 27:40)

لِيَبْلُوَنِي ءَأَشْكُرُ أَمْ أَكْفُرُ وَمَنْ شَكَرَ
فَإِنَّمَا يَشْكُرُ لِنَفْسِهِ (النمل، آیت ٤٠)

Ungratefulness or thanklessness hides the favours of the benefactors. *Kufr*, which is an opposite of *Īmān*, conceals *Tauḥīd* (oneness of Allāh), which is the demand of nature and reason, and also His innumerable favours and gifts. Thus *kufr* hides the essence as well as attributes of the Supreme Being. Further the Holy Qur'ān says:

And they measure not the power of Allāh in its true measure. (Qur'ān, 6:92)

وَمَا قَدَرُوا اللّٰهَ حَقَّ قَدْرِهِ (الانعام آیت ٩٢)

In all these verses the root of the word *kufr* means to conceal and hide. In this respect *kufr* and *kufrān* convey the same idea, but according to the religion of Islam there is some difference in their meanings. Generally, *kufr* is used to signify disbelief in Allāh—and this is antithesis of Islam and *kufrān* means ingratitude and ungratefulness, as expressed in the *Ḥadīth* containing "يكفرن العشير" "Women are ungrateful to their husbands". Shāh Ṣāḥib says that *kufr* is of two kinds viz. (i) disbelief in Allāh (i.e. rejection of the religion of Islam) and (ii) ingratitude and ungratefulness, which is referred to, in the said *Ḥadīth* as *Kufrān al-'Ashīr* (see above). These two are different kinds of *kufr* and both have various stages. The second argument said to have been given by Shāh Ṣāḥib (though it is not certain whether it has been actually given by Shāh Ṣāḥib or not) is that the commentators of the Qur'ān agree unanimously that the word *Dūna* in the following verse: "Lo! Allāh pardoneth not that partners should be ascribed unto Him. He pardoneth all save that to whom He will". (Qur'ān 4:116) means nearer and not dissimilar. The third argument is that in some editions of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* the word "بعد" (i.e. after) has been used instead of the word *Dūna* (i.e. disbelief after disbelief). The fourth argument is the opinion of Imām Bukhārī (expressed in the next chapter), namely, "a sinful person does not become a disbeliever unless he professes polytheism". Thus *kufr* has different kinds, one kind of which renders a person *kāfir* (disbeliever) and other kinds do not. Now Shāh Ṣāḥib says that if *kufr* has no different kinds but various ranks only, then there should not be any hesitation in calling a sinful person *kāfir* (unbeliever) because the root of *kufr* exists in all types of *kufr*.

The fifth argument is proved in the chapter on 'خوف المؤمن ان يحبط عمله' "The fear of the Believer is that his work may be wasted and "مايحذر من الاصرار على التقاتل" "to beware of insistence on combating".

The final discourse on the word *dūna*

In my opinion Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar's view that *dūna* means *aqrab* and *advan* means lower rank is preferable. In the first place, the real object of Imām Bukhārī, for which he thought it advisable to record that *Ḥadīth* in the *Kitāb al-Īmān* is to describe various stages and ranks of *kufr* and prove thereby the various stages and ranks of *Īmān* which is the antithesis of *kufr*. This object can be realised if the word *dūna* means nearer, and not when it means dissimilar, because dissimilar things do not prove different ranks of anything. Again, Imām Bukhārī has described various ranks of *Īmān* in different chapters of the *Kitāb al-Īmān*, as he has done in the chapters on "تفاضل اهل الايمان فى الاعمال" "Superiority of Believers in respect of good work" and "اذا لم يكن الاسلام على الحقيقة" "When Islam is not in its real sense". Here also his main object is to prove various ranks of *kufr* and not dissimilarity only. In the second place, if *dūna* means dissimilar then the phrase *kufr dūna kufr* will mean that one type of *kufr* is dissimilar to another, and dissimilarity can be proved whether the first thing is bigger and the second smaller or vice versa. Thus the above phrase will apply to *kufr* of bigger degrees and also of smaller degrees, whereas 'Aṭā' and some other scholars, who have used *dūna* in the sense of dissimilar, say that *kufr* of bigger degrees contains *kufr* of smaller degrees also, though some unintended things will come in. On the contrary, if *dūna* signifies nearer or lesser, then the meaning of the phrase will be that one type of *kufr* is lesser than another, and it will not contain major *kufr*. In the third place, *aqrab* (i.e., nearer) and *advan* (i.e. lower) are the real meanings of the word *dūna*, and there is no need of assuming another meaning. As regards the arguments advanced above (by Shāh Ṣāḥib), the fourth and fifth will be discussed in their respective chapters; and the third supports my view as the words *qablo* (before) and *ba'da* (after) ordinarily indicate different ranks. The second argument is difficult to understand because all commentators of the Qur'ān do not give preference to the idea that *dūna* signifies here dissimilar or something else.

Imām Rāgib in explanation of the Qur'ānic verse: (and He pardoneth all save that to whom He will) says:

He will pardon what is less than this, and it is also said that Allāh will pardon things other than this, and both the meanings are interlinked (i.e. one is essential to another).

وَ يَغْفِرُ مَا دُوْنَ ذَالِكَ اَىْ مَا كَانَ اَقَلَّ
مِنْ ذَالِكَ وَقِيْلَ مَا سِوٰى ذَالِكَ وَالْمَعْنَيَانِ
يَتَلَازَمَانِ

Thus the second interpretation seems to be rare, hence it has been referred to, here by Imām Rāghib under the words *Qīla* (i.e. it is said). Imām Rāghib also says that those who interpret *dūna* in the sense of dissimilar, hold that the two are essential to each other. The first argument, viz., the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter seems to have some weight because thanklessness of relatives is not of the same kind as disbelief in Allāh. But this is not a very strong argument because ingratitude and ungratefulness to relatives and benefactors are a small branch of disbelief in Allāh, as the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is reported to have said:

And he who has not expressed thanks to the people has not thanked Allāh.

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَشْكُرِ النَّاسَ فَلَمْ يَشْكُرِ اللّٰهَ

Imām Bukhārī narrates the same *Ḥadīth* of the chapter on the authority of Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī in *Kitāb al Ḥayḍ* chapter on menstruation. The sum and substance of the whole discourse is that ungratefulness to relatives is not an independent kind of *kufr*, it is only a ladder to disbelief in Allāh and it is *kufr* of minor degree. This is why some Companions asked the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "Do the women who are ungrateful to their husbands disbelieve in Allāh.?" The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) denied it and said "They do not express thanks to their husbands". In other words, they do not disbelieve in Allāh, but their ungratefulness to their husbands may be a preliminary thereto. *Kufr* has only one significance, and variation in its associates does not divide *kufr* into two. Hence there is no need of describing two kinds of *kufr* in the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter.

CHAPTER XXII

Sins are affairs of *Jāhilīyat* and a sinful person does not become a disbeliever. If he professes (or practises) polytheism then he is a disbeliever because the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) says to Abū Dhar:

Verily you are a man who has characteristics of *Jāhilīyat* (pre-Islamic period); and Allāh says: Lo! Allāh pardoneth not that partners should be ascribed unto Him. He pardoneth all save that to whom He will. (Qur'ān, 4:116)

Allāh also says:

And if two parties of Believers fall to fighting then make peace between them. (Qur'ān, 94:9)

Allāh has described both of them as Muslims)

29. We have been told by 'Abdul Raḥmān bin al-Mubārak who said that he was informed by Ḥammād bin Zayd who said: Ayyūb and Yūnus told us who said to Ḥasan who said to al-Aḥnaf bin Qays: I went so as to help this person but Abū Bakrah met me on the way and enquired where I was going. I said I was going to help this person. Abū Bakrah told me to return home because he heard:

✻ The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say:

"When two Muslims fall to fighting with swords, then the assassin and the assassinated both will go to Hell." I enquired, "O Prophet of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*)! As regards the assassin the matter is clear (i.e. he will go to Hell): but why will the assassinated person go to Hell.?" The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) replied, "He was anxious to kill his companion."

30. We have been told by Sulayman bin Ḥarb who said that he was informed by Shu'bah via Wāṣil al-Aḥdab via al-Ma'rur, that:

✻ He (last narrrtor) said: I met Abū Dhar at Rabadhah and he had put on a *Ḥullah* (a dress composed of two wrappers) and his servant had also put on a similar dress. I enquired about reason for it. Ha replied "I abused a person and his mother also." The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "O Abū Dhar! you have abused his mother. You are a man having characteristics of *Jāhilīyat*.

بَابٌ 22 الْمَعَاصِي مِنْ أَمْرِ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ

وَلَا يُكَفَّرُ صَاحِبُهَا بِارْتِكَابِهَا إِلَّا بِالشِّرْكِ لِقَوْلِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ إِنَّكَ امْرُؤٌ فِيكَ جَاهِلِيَّةٌ وَقَوْلِ اللّٰهِ تَعَالَى إِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُونَ ذٰلِكَ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ وَإِنْ طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا فَسَمَّاهُمُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ۔

29. حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّحْمٰنِ بْنُ الْمُبَارَكِ قَالَ ثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ زَيْدٍ قَالَ ثَنَا أَيُّوبُ وَيُونُسُ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ عَنِ الْأَحْنَفِ بْنِ قَيْسٍ قَالَ ذَهَبْتُ لِأَنْصُرَ هٰذَا الرَّجُلَ فَلَقِيَنِي أَبُو بَكْرَةَ فَقَالَ أَيْنَ تُرِيدُ؟ قُلْتُ أَنْصُرُ هٰذَا الرَّجُلَ قَالَ ارْجِعْ فَإِنِّي سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ إِذَا الْتَقَى الْمُسْلِمَانِ بِسَيْفَيْهِمَا فَالْقَاتِلُ وَالْمَقْتُولُ فِي النَّارِ قُلْتُ يَا رَسُولَ اللّٰهِ هٰذَا الْقَاتِلُ فَمَا بَالُ الْمَقْتُولِ قَالَ إِنَّهُ كَانَ حَرِيصًا عَلَى قَتْلِ صَاحِبِهِ۔

30. حَدَّثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ بْنُ حَرْبٍ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا شُعْبَةُ عَنْ وَاصِلٍ الْأَحْدَبِ عَنِ الْمَعْرُورِ قَالَ لَقِيتُ أَبَا ذَرٍّ بِالرَّبَذَةِ وَعَلَيْهِ حُلَّةٌ وَعَلَى غُلَامِهِ حُلَّةٌ فَسَأَلْتُهُ عَنْ ذٰلِكَ فَقَالَ إِنِّي سَابَبْتُ رَجُلًا فَعَيَّرْتُهُ بِأُمِّهِ فَقَالَ لِيَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَا أَبَا ذَرٍّ أَعَيَّرْتَهُ بِأُمِّهِ إِنَّكَ امْرُؤٌ فِيكَ جَاهِلِيَّةٌ إِخْوَانُكُمْ خَوَلُكُمْ جَعَلَهُمُ اللّٰهُ تَحْتَ أَيْدِيكُمْ فَمَنْ كَانَ أَخُوهُ تَحْتَ يَدِهِ فَلْيُطْعِمْهُ مِمَّا يَأْكُلُ وَلْيُلْبِسْهُ مِمَّا يَلْبَسُ وَلَا تُكَلِّفُوهُمْ مَا يَغْلِبُهُمْ فَإِنْ كَلَّفْتُمُوهُمْ فَأَعِينُوهُمْ۔

Your slave is your brother. Allāh has placed him under you. So whoever has a brother under him must give him to eat what he himself eats and give him to wear what he himself wears. Further, he must not burden him with a task which is beyond his scope, and if he imposes any difficult task on him he must help him."

The term *Jāhilīyat* covers the period which commences after Ḥaḍrat 'Īsā (may peace be on him) and ends before the advent of Islam. During this period no revealed religion was really in force and ungodliness reigned supreme. Here the word *Jāhilīyat* signifies *kufr* (disbelief) but Imām Bukhārī has used *Jāhilīyat* instead of *kufr* in consideration of the words of *Ḥadīth*. There are two *Aḥādīth* in this chapter, of which the first is the chief object and the other only meets objections, if any. The idea is that just as good deeds being part of *Īmān* (Faith) are included in *Īmān* so also sins and misdeeds being parts of *kufr* (disbelief) are included in *kufr*.

Objects of *Ḥadīth*

The necessity of good work has been established in previous chapters. Now the evil consequences of sins are described in this chapter. In this way the theory of the Murji'ah sect has been completely repudiated. Because misdeeds are things of the period of *Jāhilīyat* and *kufr*, and all sins have some sorts of *kufr*, therefore they must affect *Īmān* adversely. In order to refute the views of the Khawrijites and the Mutazilites the author has narrated the *Ḥadīth* and the person who commits this sin will not become a disbeliever unless he professes (or practises) polytheism. In other words, sins are branches of *kufr* but, as one type of *kufr* is smaller than another, none can be declared as *kāfir* until he associates partnership to Allāh.

The expression "on account of the saying of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)" relates to the first part of the *Ḥadīth* and the saying of Allāh proves the second part. Afterwards Imām Bukhārī mentions the *Ḥadīth* of Abū Dhar which is obviously connected with the main part of the *Ḥadīth*. The second part of *Ḥadīth* is also proved thereby because Abū Dhar's eminence and excellence as a Believer is beyond question. The first part of the *Ḥadīth* repudiates the Murji'ah sect and the second part thereof refutes the Khawrijites and Mu'tazilites. The expression *Kufrun dūna Kufrin* (one type of *Kufr* is smaller than another) in the first chapter also aimed at the refutation of the Murji'ahs, but the author does not mention it clearly. As usual he has only pointed it out.

In the explanation of the preceding chapter I observed that Mawlānā Anwar Shāh Ṣāḥib has inferred from (the person who commits a sin does not become a *kāfir* until he ascribes partnership to Allāh) that the word *dūna* means other or dissimilar. But this is not a sound argument because just as variation in kind leads to variation in their applications, so also variation in ranks results in variation in their applications. For example, fever, is one kind of disease, but owing to its different degrees sometimes fever becomes dangerous and fatal and sometimes not. One kind of medicine is prescribed for one type of fever and another for another.

Use of an adjective for a verb

Anyhow whether *kufr* has various kinds or ranks, there is one objection here, viz, When a person has *kufr* (of one kind or one degree) why is he not called *kāfir* because the characteristics of the root pervade all its branches.? This objection is met in several ways. Some scholars say that *kāfir* in this case must not mean one who will perpetually remain in Hell like a polytheist. The best reply has been given by Ibnul Qayyim who says that it is true that according to lexicon (or dictionary) and common sense what applies to the source of a thing must apply to all things derived from it—whether the source is strong or weak, but according to generally used term it is not so. This is why it is said that a verb is used for any work whether it is done once or more) whereas an adjective (or nominative) is not generally used for a work which is done only once or twice. For examples, if a person speaks the truth once or twice it will be said that he spoke the truth: and not that he is truthful man, or if a man speaks a lie once or twice it will be said that he spoke a lie, not that he is a liar. Similarly, if a man steals an ordinary pen or piece of paper, he will be a thief literally, but not according to the usually accepted term. This may be explained by two examples (i) If a man picks up some knowledge of medicine or Islamic jurisprudence (Fiqh) he will not be designated a physician or an expert in jurisprudence (ii) if a person gets a few pice by begging, then he becomes rich in the literal sense because he has some money but he is not called a rich man.

To call a person *kāfir*

From the above it is evident that application of the characteristics of the source to all things derived therefrom requires the existence of certain qualities or quantities of the same therein. Hence before a person is called *kāfir* it is necessary to ascertain how much of *kufr* he has. When the requisite amount of *kufr* is found in any man he will be called *kāfir*, otherwise not. The Holy Qur'ān describes the requisite quantity of *kufr* as follows: "Lo! Allāh pardoneth not that partners should be ascribed to Him, and He pardoneth all save that to whom He will." (Qur'ān, 4:116)

Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās supports this view, as Hashīmī has recorded the following passage in *Majma'al Zawā'id* on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās :

He (Ibn 'Abbās) enumerated several things and then said that if a person abandons such and such thing it will be said that he has *kufr* in him and not that he has become *kāfir* (disbeliever).

أَنَّهُ عَدَّ عِدَّةَ أَشْيَاءَ ثُمَّ قَالَ وَيُقَالُ
بِتَرْكِهِ بِهٖ كُفْرٌ وَّلَا يُقَالُ إِنَّهُ كَافِرٌ

Ḥaḍrat 'Alī is reported to have said the same thing, but one of the transmitters of his saying is a liar. Dāramī who was older than Bukhārī, though belonging to the same period, has also said the same thing.

There is an objection here, viz. the Holy Qur'ān clearly says :

"And whoso judgeth not by that which Allāh hath revealed: Such are disbelievers. (Qur'ān, 5:44)

This verse does not make mention of any particular nature or quantity of *kufr*. The reply is that our discourse relates to a particular person or persons but there is room for making a general remark on the basis of certain factors e.g., the Holy Qur'ān says,

The curse of Allāh upon those who lie. (Qur'ān, 3:61)

لَعْنَةُ اللّٰهِ عَلَى الْكَاذِبِيْنَ

But it is not permissible to curse any particular Muslim even if he speaks falsely. We cannot say about any Muslim "May Allāh curse you" or "May Allāh curse Zayd. etc. Apart from the above objection and its reply it may be said that restrictions regarding the use of the term *kāfir* for any person are meant for us and not for Allāh and His Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) who make assertions in the universal interest of mankind and for the betterment of their general condition in this world and in the next. The expression:

The virtues of good people are vices for divinely gifted persons.
حَسَنَاتُ الْاَبْرَارِ سَيِّئَاتُ الْمُقَرَّبِيْنَ

The object of the *Ḥadīth*, "And the person who commits a sin will not become a disbeliever until he professes (or practises) polytheism" is that in those places where the word *kufr* has been used for any sin or misdeed we shall have to understand it in accordance with the expression *Kufrun dūna Kufrin*. We cannot go beyond the principle of Islam. According to the teaching of Islam we cannot call any Muslim *kāfir*. Bukhārī also points to the same conclusion, and the word "لایکفر" is a verb of the future tense[1].

As (but by polytheism) is used in the Qur'ānic verse, الا بالشرک Imām Bukhārī has done the same. *Shirk* is a particular term and means to worship any thing other than Allāh, and *kufr* is a general term. A believer in oneness of Allāh but disbeliever in Prophethood of Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is a *kāfir*, not a *mushrik*. Similarly, one who disbelieves in the existence of Allāh altogether, like a naturalist. is a *kāfir* but not a *mushrik* (polytheist).

There is an objection here. As a polytheist is not pardoned, so also a disbeliever is not pardoned. But all disbelievers are not included in the Qur'ānic verse.

Several replies have been given. Some scholars say that though *shirk* is a particular term, it is used here in a general sense and covers all kinds of infidelity. Others say that disbelief is certainly part and parcel of polytheism and hence included therein. The Holy Qur'ān says:

Say not "Fie" unto them nor repulse them, but speak unto them a gracious word. (Qur'ān, 17:23)
فَلَا تَقُلْ لَّهُمَآ اُفٍّ وَّلَا تَنْهَرْهُمَا وَقُلْ لَّهُمَا قَوْلًا كَرِيْمًا ۝ (بنی اسرائیل، آیت ۲۳)

Though the people have been forbidden to say "fie" to their parents and repulse them, other kinds of maltreatments, such as, abusing, evil doing etc. are also included therein. It is obvious that a naturalist (i.e. disbeliever in Allāh), will not be pardoned. Similarly, if a person disbelieves in the Prophethood of Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلی الله علیه وسلم) he also will not be forgiven, because disbelief in the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) leads essentially to disbelief in Allāh as well. The Holy Qur'ān says:

In truth they deny not thee (O Muḥammad) but evil doers flout the revelations of Allāh. (Qur'ān, 6:33)
فَاِنَّهُمْ لَا يُكَذِّبُوْنَكَ وَلٰكِنَّ الظّٰلِمِيْنَ بِاٰيٰتِ اللّٰهِ يَجْحَدُوْنَ ۝ (انعام، آیت ۳۳)

In my opinion *kufr* is a more common term than *shirk* and the former can be conceived separately from the latter. But in actual existence both the terms are interrelated. During the time of revelation of the Qur'ān the most prominent sects in the world were *Mushrikīn* (polytheists) Magians, Jews and Christians, and all of them were polytheists. The *Mushrikīn's* case is obvious. The Magians believe in two gods i.e., Yazdān (god for good) and Ahraman (god for evil) and they worship fire. The Christians believe in Trinity i.e. three gods. The Qur'ān says about the Christians:

---

[1] The meaning is that such a person will not be declared *Kāfir* in the future. The *Ḥadīth* in question refers to the past and this is also a warning for future.

They surely disbelieve who say: Lo! Allāh is the third of three.
(Qur'ān, 5:73)

لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِيْنَ قَالُوْٓا اِنَّ اللّٰهَ ثَالِثُ ثَلٰثَةٍ ، (سورہ مائدہ، آیت ۷۳)

Priest Funder's Fraud

Priest Funder writes in the book *Mīzān al-Ḥaq* that there is one in three and three in one, and as his claim is not only absurd but impossible and beyond human intellect, no amount of his far-fetched arguments could help him. At last he tried to save his skin by saying that the Christians' doctrine of Trinity and Unity is just like the *Mutashābihāt* (Allegorical things) of the Muslims, and the former is beyond the scope of reason like the latter.

Difference between what bewilders intellect and what is impossible

There is a great difference between the Christian's doctrines of Trinity and Unity and the Muslim's *Mutashābihāt*. Human intellect rejects the former as something impossible and unreasonable. No jugglery of words and no amount of deception can make an impossible thing possible and an unreasonable matter reasonable. On the contrary, the *Mutashābihāt* i.e. allegorical things of the Muslims are within the scope of human intellect, though beyond the reach of common understanding. They perplex our minds on account of their particular significance. But the Christian doctrine is impossible as well as inconceivable. One cannot be three nor can three be one. This whole theory is non-sensical and absurd. In other words, the existence of *Mutashābihāt* allegorical or figurative things are not impossible or inconceivable by their nature, though human intellect does not fully understand their nature, manner and eminence. For example, the Holy Qur'ān makes mention of "Hands of Allāh," "Face of Allāh" etc. These things bewilder our minds but they are not impossible according to human intellect.

As regards the Jews, the Holy Qur'ān says:

And the Jews say: Ezra ('Uzayr) is the son of Allāh and the Christian say: The Messiah (Masīḥ) is the son of Allāh.
(Qur'ān, 9:30)

وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُوْدُ عُزَيْرُ ابْنُ اللّٰهِ وَقَالَتِ النَّصٰرَى الْمَسِيْحُ ابْنُ اللّٰهِ (التوبہ، آیت ۳۰)

The Jews of the present time deny that they believe that 'Uzayr (Ezra) is God's son. It is possible that the sect of the Jews who held this belief during the revelation of the Qur'ān does not exist now. But history does not provide a single case in which any Jew or any other person took exception to the above verse. During the period when the Qur'ān was revealed the people of 'Arabia moved heaven and earth to criticise the religion of Islam and eliminate the universal effects of the Qur'ān. Madīnah was then the centre of the Jews, and had there been a single thing in the Qur'ān against the established fact, the entire Jewish community would have raised hue and cry against Islam and its Founder. Those Jews who had embraced Islam, such as 'Abdullāh bin Salām, would have presented their objections to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), had there been any factual error. When the verse of the Qur'ān "They have taken as lords their *rabbīs* and priests beside Allāh" was revealed, 'Adī bin Ḥātim, who was a Christian before accepting Islam, presented his objection to the Holy Prophet

(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the latter replied that it was the prerogative of Allāh to decide what was lawful and what was unlawful, and when the people of the revealed Books transferred that power to their *rabbīs* and their monks, they practically raised them to the rank of the Divine Being.

It is absurd to suppose that there was some criticism to the above-quoted verse at that time but it has not come down to us. It is preposterous to think that the Qur'ān spread throughout the length and breadth of the world but the criticism of the enemies of Islam whose number was always very large did not get publicity.

An evidence regarding 'Uzayr (Ezra)

A reliable person, late Ḥājī Amīr Shāh Khān, said to me personally: "I travelled far and wide and wherever I went I tried to trace that sect which believed in 'Uzayr being a son of Allāh. When I reached Syria and I met the Jews there, all of them denied that belief. But after trying in several places there I came to know that there is a village named ('Uzayriah), the inhabitants of which still believe that 'Uzayr is a son of Allāh. I went to that village and met several prsons there. On my enquiry they confessed that just as the Muslims believe that Allāh is one Who is the Creator of the universe, so also they believed in 'Uzayr being a son of Allāh. Further, I knew that the number of such Jews was very small and their general condition was miserable.

Truthfulness of the Qur'an and disbelievers' nonsensical views

Apart from the above, what passes human intellect is the fact that some unreasonable and nonsensical views of the Jews are still found in their *Torāt* (Old Testament) which has been adulterated very badly. For examples: It is recorded in *Torāt* that when Allāh was apprised of the universal destruction caused by the Deluge of Prophet Noah, He could not help Himself and therefore wept bitterly. The Holy Qur'ān says:

Dreadful is the word that cometh out of their mouths. They speak naught but a lie. (Qur'ān, 18:5)	كَبُرَتْ كَلِمَةً تَخْرُجُ مِنْ أَفْوَاهِهِمْ إِنْ يَقُولُونَ إِلَّا كَذِبًا ۝ (کہف، آیت ۵)

It is also recorded in *Torāt* that once Allāh and Prophet Ya'qūb (Jecob) fought with the result that the latter vanquished the former. Common sense demands that if the Christians have become polytheists by taking Ḥaḍrat 'Īsā (Jesus Christ) as Allāh's son, the Jews also have become polytheists by declaring Prophet Ya'qūb more powerful than Allāh Himself or by believing that the agency which had destroyed the whole world (during the Deluge of Prophet Noah) against the will and knowledge of Allāh was more resourceful than Allāh.

In addition to the above, the Jews and Christians relapsed into *shirk* (polytheism) in another way, as the Qur'ān says:

They have taken as lords beside Allāh their rabb's and their monks. (Qur'ān, 9:31)	اِتَّخَذُوْٓا اَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ اَرْبَابًا مِّنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ ۔ (توبہ، آیت ۳۱)

This is also an open and plain polvtheism "شرک جلی" which has been detailed earlier in connection with the *Ḥadīth* regarding the Roman emperor Heraclus. In short, all the sects of disbelievers during the time of the revelation of the Qur'ān were victims both of infidelity and polytheism. Similar belief is current now in several countries. For example, in addition to the Jews and Christians there are three communities in India which are unbelievers, namely, (i) the *Hindūs* (ii) ***Āryā Samāj*** and (iii) the ***Sikhs***. The *Hindūs* publicly worship thousands of deities. Though the ***Āryā Samāj*** claim to believe in *Tauḥīd* (oneness of Allāh), in practice they also ascribe partnership to Allāh because they maintain that three things are eternal and essential in existence, viz (i) Parmātamā (i.e., God) (ii) Matter which they call Prakartī (which consists of innumerable particles) and (iii) Soul (which they call Jeyo). Thus they believe that all the three possess elements of Godhead. The ***Sikhs*** have more or less, the same sort of belief. They worship Granth and cows, though some of them deny that they worship cows. As regards the founder of ***Sikhism***, the most authentic view is that he was a devout Muslim who attended the spiritual discourse of Bābā Farīduddīn Shakar Ganj and who performed *Ḥajj* also. He freely mixed with the *Hindūs* and tried to guide them on the right path. What happened to him later on is known to Allāh alone. His followers are known as ***Sikh***. Thus it is evident that every sect of unbelievers has some sort of *shirk* (polytheism) together with *kufr* (infidelity). Though the word of ***Shirk*** is often used in the Qur'ān to warn the people against ascribing partnership to Allāh, it signifies *kufr* (infidelity) in general. It is a pointer to the fact that whenever disbelief comes it is accompanied generally by polytheism also. ***Kufr*** is a wider term than *shirk*, and though by nature they are not essential to each other, in actual existence they are so. The Qur'ān says:

"And if two parties of Believers وَاِنْ طَآئِفَتٰنِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ اقْتَتَلُوْا فَاَصْلِحُوْا بَيْنَهُمَا fall to fighting, then make peace between them" (Qur'ān 49:9).

This verse supports the second part of the ***Ḥadīth*** of the chapter in as far as fighting with Muslims is a major sin and still both the parties are referred to, as Muslim. This verse repudiates the theory of the Mu'tazilites who hold that those who commit major sins cease to be Muslim. The Qur'ān calls the Muslims who fought among themselves as ***Mu'minīn*** (Believers) and not as Muslims only. This Qur'ānic verse also refutes the views of the Khāwrijites who maintain that the persons who commit big sins become disbelievers. Far from declaring them (the Muslims who fought among themselves) as infidels the Qur'ān called them "Believers" and ordered that they must be reconciled. The verse of the Qur'ān endorses the theory of the **Ḥ**anafīs who hold that the absence of good deeds does not necessarily eliminate *Īmān* (Belief). In the preceding *Ḥadīth* Aḥnaf bin Qays is reported to have said: I went from my home to assist this man (Ḥaḍrat 'Alī) who was the Head of the community. (According to one version of the *Ḥadīth* he said that he went out with his people). It is stated clearly in *Fatḥul Bārī* that this *Ḥadīth* relates to the battle of camels. Anyhow, Abū Bakrah met him (Aḥnaf bin Qays) and asked him where he was going: He replied that he was going to assist a certain person. Then Abū Bakrah said: Return home and keep away from disturbances, because the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: "When two Muslims oppose each other with swords (in their hands), the assassin and assassinated both will go to Hell" I enquired: "O Prophet of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم)! what is the fault of the assassinated person"? He replied. "Because he was anxious to kill his companion and it was by chance only that he did not succeed.

Difference between intentions and anxiety

There is difference between what a man intends to do and what he is anxious to do. In the first case opinions differ. Some scholars say that man is answerable even for his evil designs and others say that he is not liable for chastisement, unless he translates his intention into action. The word *Ḥarīṣ* (i.e. anxious) used in the *Ḥadīth* is stronger than *'Azm* (i.e., intention). By *Ḥarīṣ* is meant a person who tries his utmost to do a certain thing and employs all means for the realisation of his object. Now a person is certainly subject to punishment if he is anxious or serious to do any evil act. Anyhow, the Qur'ān commands the Muslims to stop fighting among their co-religionists and try to effect peace and friendship among them on the basis of impartiality and honesty.

'When two Muslims fall to fighting'. Abū Bakrah يَقُوْلُ اِذَا الْتَقَى الْمُسْلِمَانِ has narrated this *Ḥadīth* in connection with the incident between Ḥaḍrat 'Alī and Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah, which seems to be out of place here. This *Ḥadīth* is intended for those people who fight unjustifiably without any *tāwīl* (interpretation) or justification, and not for those people who fight for the religion and believe that their action is in the interest of the Muslims. This *Ḥadīth* is not to be taken in a general sense because it is specifically meant for two or more Muslims who fight among themselves wrongly and without any solid reason Ḥaḍrat 'Alī and Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah or Ḥaḍrat 'Alī and Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah were fighting for Islam on the basis of difference of opinion and judgment, and both the parties were right in their own opinions based on fair reasoning. After all they were *Mujtahid* (i.e., learned divines who are capable of solving religious problems within the framework of the fundamental principles of Islam).

Abū Bakrah related this *Ḥadīth* for some purpose i.e. to prevent the Muslims from joining the civil war. Otherwise he never intended to apply this *Ḥadīth* to Ḥaḍrat 'Alī, Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah and Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah. As for Ḥaḍrat 'Alī, he is included in the ten Companions, who were promised Paradise by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and whose merits are as bright as day light. Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah was also a respectable Companion and a scribe of Divine Revelations. He was also a brother-in-law of the Holy Prophet. Abū Bakrah desired to diminish the chances of a civil war among various sections of the Muslim community and therefore narrated the above *Ḥadīth* as a warning to the Muslims against the disastrous consequences of their hostility, if it continued unabated.

Muslim Jurisprudents maintain that if a Muslim asks a question "whether fasting is wasted by backbiting or not?", and if it is known that he does not indulge in backbiting but he may possibly do so in future, then the correct answer is to narrate Holy Prophet's *Ḥadīth* to the effect that fasting is wasted by backbiting. Abū Bakrah had the same object in view, and it produced the desired effect. Aḥnaf bin Qays did not join the battle of camels, though he knew that the above-quoted *Ḥadīth* did not apply to Ḥaḍrat 'Alī and Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah, but he participated in the battle of *Ṣaffayn* on the side of Ḥaḍrat 'Alī.

Thus we cannot say about any Muslim "that he will go to Hell." If he has made an error in his efforts and has done something wrong it will be insignificant in comparison with his merits and good deeds. This point can be explained by referring to the incident of Prophets

Mūsā (Moses) and Hārūn (Aaron) (peace be on them) mentioned in the Holy Qur'ān: "He (Hārūn) said: O son of my mother! clutch not my beard nor my head" (Qur'ān 20:94). Prophet Hārūn was endowed with Prophethood on the recommendation of his brother. Once Prophet Mūsā (Moses) caught hold of the beard of his brother (Prophet Hārūn), but this cannot be regarded a token of contempt or insult. It was simply a misunderstanding or difference of opinion. Similarly, Companions had difference of views, but this does not take one to Hell. The *Ḥadīth* "When two Muslims fall to fighting" follows the *Ḥadīth* "the assassin and assassinated both are in Hell." It is, therefore, clear that they do not cease to be Muslim and it is quite correct that such a person (i.e. sinful) should not be declared a disbeliever.

Ma'rūr says: I met عَنِ الْمَعْرُوْرِ قَالَ لَقِيْتُ اَبَا ذَرٍّ بِالرَّبَذَةِ وَعَلَيْهِ حُلَّةٌ وَّعَلٰى غُلَامِهٖ حُلَّةٌ Abū Dhar at Rabadhah. He had put on a *ḥullah* (two wrappers) and his servant had also put on a *ḥullah*. Rabadhah, three miles off from Madīnah, had a cantonment where several thousand horses were housed. According to the Arabs *Ḥullah* is a dress composed of two wrappers—one is used on the lower part of body and the other on the upper part thereof. It is like Pakistani pushāk or dress. The *Ḥadīth* apparently indicates that both had a similar dress, but from other *Aḥādīth* it is gathered that Abū Dhar had cloth of one kind and his servant had another. I (the narrator) asked Abū Dhar! "What is the matter? You and your servant are wearning the same dress?" He replied, "Let me relate the whole story."

I abused a man and insulted him by abusing his سَابَبْتُ رَجُلًا فَعَيَّرْتُهٗ بِاُمِّهٖ mother also and told him "O son of a slave girl" Now who was this abused person? According to some people, it was Ḥaḍrat Bilāl, and according to others it was 'Ammār son of Yāsir. 'Ammār's mother, Sumayyah was not really a slave, but she was made so by force according to the customs of pre-Islamic Arabs. As a matter of fact she was a respectable Companion like her son 'Ammār. She (Sumayyah) was murdered (i.e. martyred) by Abū Jahl at Makkah when she embraced Islam. She was perhaps the first person who sacrificed her life for the sake of Islam. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said to Abū Dhar.

"You have put him to disgrace by اَعَيَّرْتَهٗ بِاُمِّهٖ اِنَّكَ امْرُءٌ فِيْكَ جَاهِلِيَّةٌ abusing his mother". "اخوانكم خولكم" *Khaul* means slave and a common servant who can be utilised by his master, but the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) says "Allāh has placed him (slave) under your charge and you must not be hard to him. Give him to eat what you eat and give him to wear what you wear. Do not burden him with a difficult task, and if you want him to do a hard work assist him." The Holy Prophet did not mean to say that master and servant must be equated with each other completely. What he meant was that master must extend full sympathy, cooperation and kindness to his servant. But it was the highest degree of piety and chastity on the part of Abū Dhar that he implemented each and every word of the Prophet literally and efficiently, and thereby tried his best to eliminate all kinds of difference between master and slave Abū Dhar made it a point to be very cautious in following the precepts and practices of the Prophet as sincerely as possible. Several anecdotes about him are well-known. Now if a person adopts complete equality between master and slave, it will certainly go to his credit, but it is not obligatory as the expression "Give his slave to eat from what he himself eats and give him to wear what he himself wears from" is quite clear. The word "من" "from" in the *Ḥadīth* indicates partial equality, and not complete identity.

The *Ḥadīth* forbids us to abuse servants or slaves (or othes) and insult them by taunting their parents. It also commands us to be considerate and lenient to them in general. It is not permissible for any one to refer to other people with contempt or insult on the basis of family weakness or otherwise. Nor is it allowed for any person to boast of his high parentage.

The word 'slave' in the *Ḥadīth* includes all people who come practically under that category e.g. labourers, servants, employees, weak people etc. (Animals also must be treated well). We must treat all of them with fairness and sympathy. If we impose difficult tasks on them we must help them and share their burden. This *Ḥadīth* also shows that one must not regard oneself superior to others—they may be slaves or weak persons—in any way. In short the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) warned Abū Dhar but did not declare him to be non-Muslim. Thus the claim is proved that it is not permissible to call a Muslim an infidel on account of his sins.

CHAPTER XXIII

One sin is smaller than another.

31. We have been told by Abul Walīd who said that he was informed by Shu'bah, (Another chain of transmitters): Imām Bukhārī said: I have been told by Bishr who was informed by Muḥammad via Shu'bah via Sulaymān via Ibrāhīm via 'Alqamah who (last narrator) heard:

✶ 'Abdullāh bin Mas'ūd say:

When the Qur'ānic verse, "Those who believe and obscure not their belief by wrong-doing theirs is safety, and they are rightly guide" was revealed, the Companions of the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) asked him, "Who among us has not done wrong?" Then Allāh the Most Glorified and Exalted, revealed the verse, "Lo! to ascribe partners (unto Allāh) is a termendous wrong". (Qur'ān, 31:13)

بَابٌ 23 ظُلْمٌ دُوْنَ ظُلْمٍ

31. حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْوَلِيْدِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا شُعْبَةُ
ح قَالَ وَحَدَّثَنِيْ بِشْرٌ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدٌ
عَنْ شُعْبَةَ عَنْ سُلَيْمَانَ عَنْ إِبْرَاهِيْمَ عَنْ
عَلْقَمَةَ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ قَالَ لَمَّا نَزَلَتِ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا
وَلَمْ يَلْبِسُوْٓا اِيْمَانَهُمْ بِظُلْمٍ قَالَ أَصْحَابُ
رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَيُّنَا
لَمْ يَظْلِمْ فَأَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ إِنَّ الشِّرْكَ
لَظُلْمٌ عَظِيْمٌ

Ḥaḍrat 'Abdullāh bin Masūd says that when the verse:

> Those who believe and obscure not their belief by wrong-doing theirs is safety; and they are rightly guided.
>
> (Qur'ān, 6:83)

اَلَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَلَمْ يَلْبِسُوْٓا اِيْمَانَهُمْ بِظُلْمٍ
أُولٰٓئِكَ لَهُمُ الْاَمْنُ وَهُمْ مُّهْتَدُوْنَ (انعام آيت ٨٣)

was revealed, the Companions were grieved to know that this verse applied to those Believers who did not obscure their belief by wrong-doing and that safety was confined to them only. The word *Ẓulm* (i.e. wrong-doing) in the verse is a common noun and the sentence is negative; hence its negation means negation of all kinds of evil. The Companions naturally apprehended because very few persons could possibly abstain from all kinds of wrong-doing. The word "لبس" (from "ضرب يضرب") means to mingle two things in such a way that one is merged in the other and no distinction remains, between the two, whereas the word "لبس" (from "سمع يسمع") means to wear.

The Companions said to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم),: "Who among us has not done wrong? We are apt to commit some sins or others. None save the Apostle of Allāh is innocent. When safety is confined to the persons who abstain from wrong-doing, it is evident that none can be safe (excepting Prophets of Allāh)". The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) quoted the Qur'ānic verse, "Lo! to ascribe partners (unto Allāh) is a tremendous wrong" (Qur'ān 31:13)

The expression "ظلم دون ظلم" "one sin is smaller than another" is part of the statement of 'Aṭā' bin Abī Rıbāḥ. The word "دون" "meaning smaller" in the sentence "کفر دون کفر" "one kind of *kufr* is smaller than another" has already been discussed earlier. The same may be said here also. According to the Qur'ānic verse *Shirk* (polytheism) and *kufr* (disbelief) are two items of *Ẓulm* (wrong-doing). The *Ḥadīth* of the chapter indicates that wrong-doing has various degrees and the Qur'ān also points to it, and this is the objective of Imām Bukhārī.

Kinds of *Ẓulm*

Ẓulm (wrong-doing) is of three kinds, viz (i) the first is between Allāh and His slaves (created beings), such as, ascribing lies to Allāh, disbelief, polytheism, attributing any defect or weakness to Allāh, etc., (ii) the second is between man and man, which is usually called oppression and cruelty, and (iii) the third is between one and one self i.e. a man does a work which harms himself, e.g. to take poison. (About such a person it is said that he has wronged himself.) The first two necessitate the third also, i.e., whenever a person does the wrong of the first two kinds, he cannot but commit the third also, because he is punished for the first two sins and consequently he harms himself. In some version of the *Ḥadīth* "اینا لم یظلم نفسه" which means "Who is among us who has not wronged himself?" is used.

ثُمَّ أَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ إِنَّ الشِّرْكَ لَظُلْمٌ عَظِيمٌ

Allāh, the Most Exalted and Glorified, revealed the verse "ان الشرک لظلم عظیم" "Lo! to ascribe partners (unto Allāh) is a tremendous wrong" (Qur'ān, 31:13). When the Companions had some misgivings regarding the first Qur'ānic verse, the second verse was revealed to remove that misgiving, and the above *Ḥadīth* apparently favours it. This is the view of some commentators of the Qur'ān. But according to some narrations of the *Ḥadīth* the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) is reported to have said, in reply to the Companions' misgiving :

لَيْسَ كَمَا تَقُولُونَ إِنَّمَا هُوَ الشِّرْكُ أَوَلَمْ
تَسْمَعُوا قَوْلَ لُقْمَانَ لِابْنِهِ إِنَّ الشِّرْكَ لَظُلْمٌ
عَظِيمٌ ۝

The matter is not as you say, but *shirk* (polytheism) is meant by the word *Ẓulm* here. Have you not heard what Luqmān said to his son, "Lo! to ascribe partners (unto Allāh) is a tremendous wrong?"

From this version it is quite clear that the second verse was revealed before the first, hence the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) referred to it (second verse) by way of confirmation of what he said. The sentence "فانزل الله" "Then Allāh revealed" apparently contradicted this view, but this is not the case. This sentence has been used in a wide sense. This may be explained by an example :

If somebody tells an adulterer that the verse :

اَلزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي فَاجْلِدُوا كُلَّ وَاحِدٍ
مِّنْهُمَا مِائَةَ جَلْدَةٍ ص (نور، آیت ۲)

The adulteress and the adulterer, scourge ye each one of them (with) a hundred stripes. (Qur'ān, 24:2) was revealed for him, or tells a thief that the verse:

As for the thief, both male and female, cutt off their hands. (Qur'ān, 5:38) اَلسَّارِقُ وَالسَّارِقَةُ فَاقْطَعُوْٓا اَيْدِيَهُمَا (مائدہ آیت ٣٨)

was revealed for him, it will mean that two verses apply to him also not that they were revealed for him, because the Qur'ān was revealed about fourteen centuries ago. This contradiction is removed by interpreting the word *Ẓulm* (in the Qur'ānic verse) in the sense of *shirk* (polytheism).

Why did not the Companions interpret *Ẓulm* as *Shirk*?

Commentators of *Aḥādīth* have given two explanations for the above, viz (i) the word *ẓulm* (in the above quoted verse of the Qur'ān) is a common noun and the sentence is in the negative; therefore its negation signifies negation of all kinds of wrong-doing. Thus the Companions took the word *Ẓulm* in a wide sense but the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) specified it and said that this word was used in the sense of *shirk* (and not any kind of evil as the Companions had understood it). This is the view of Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib and some others (ii) Khaṭṭābī has explained the subject in another way, which is accepted by Qāḍī Bayḍāwī and mentioned by 'Aynī. The substance of this explanation is that though the word *Ẓulm* literally includes all kinds of evil (i.e. *shirk* and smaller sins), it is used generally and usually in the sense of wrong-doing (smaller than *shirk*). The Companions asserted "Who among us has not wronged?" The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) replied, "Why do you take it in the sense of any sin. *Ẓulm* signifies *shirk* here (as Luqmān said)".

In short, according to the first explanation, the Companions generalised the term *ẓulm* and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) specified it, and according to the second explanation, the Companions took the word *ẓulm* specifically in the sense of sins smaller than *shirk*. But the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) generalised it so as to include *shirk* and other sins therein. Here, by *Ẓulm* is meant a tremendous wrong, viz *shirk*.

Evidence for interpreting *Ẓulm* as *Shirk*

Now I explain the verse. Learned scholars discuss the point as to whether there is any evidence in support of the view that *Ẓulm* in the verse means *shirk* or the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself interpreted it in that way. Some scholars say that this question is absurd. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was a receiver of Divine Revelations (i.e. Allāh was the Speaker and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was the first addressee), hence there is no need of any evidence. Evidence is like a stick which is required for a blind man, never for one who is far-sighted and fore-sighted. But some research scholars hold that though evidence is not necessary for the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to whom the Qur'ān was revealed, there is no harm if evidence is available in confirmation of the above view.

Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim writes that there is evidence in the Qur'ānic verse itself in support of the view that *Ẓulm* stands here for *shirk*. The word "لبس" "in the Qur'ānic verse" means to mingle two things in one pot in such a way that one is merged in the other, and all distinctions between the two are removed. For example, if a syrup is to be prepared, water and sugar must be mingled in one pot completely but if they are placed in two different pots no syrup can be made.

The Qur'ān refers to the Believers who did not mingle *Ẓulm* (wrong-doing) with *Īmān*. This indicates that *Zulm* and *Īmān* are located in the same place, e.g. *Īmān* has a seat in heart so also has *Ẓulm*. Obviously, *Ẓulm* here will mean *shirk* which is located in heart along with *Īmān*. As sins other than *shirk* are committed by different parts of body, they are located in places other than hearts.

The above evidence is not quite convincing, because, though heart and parts of body are different things, they are not really two separate places of accommodation. As both of them co-exist in man, they may be regarded as one common place of residence. Hence, the Companions were perplexed in understanding the significance of the *Ḥadīth*, and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was pleased to clarify the matter. Now what connection is there between this *Ḥadīth* and the expression "ظلم دون ظلم" "i.e. one sin is smaller than another". 'Allāmah 'Aynī and some other scholars say that the Companions interpreted *Ẓulm* as sin here, whereas the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) took it in the sense of *shirk*. In other words, the Companions considered the smaller kind of *Zulm* and the Prophet, the highest kind of the same. That *ẓulm* has various ranks and degrees is amply proved by the fact that the Holy Qur'ān has described *shirk* as "ظلم عظيم" "a tremendous wrong." The word *'Aẓīm* leaves no room for doubt that some kinds of *ẓulm* are small (less than *shirk*) and others are great, such as *shirk* (polytheism). It is a sin to kill a person and it is also a sin to give him a slap, but both are not equal sins.

There is one *Ḥadīth* "الظلم ظلمات يوم القيامة" i.e. wrong-doing will be layer of darkness on the Day of Judgment. The Qur'ān says :

i.e. Layer upon layer of darkness (Qur'ān, 24:40) "ظلمات بعضها فوق بعض".

Contest with the Mu'tazilites

The Mu'tazilites maintain that a person who commits a major sin becomes a disbeliever and will always remain in Hell. They advance the Qur'ānic verse "ولم يلبسوا ايمانهم" "Those who believe and obscure not their belief by wrong-doing" in support of their theory. Zamakhsharī and some others say that the Qur'ānic verse clearly says that a person who is guilty of wrong-doing will not be safe from the punishment of Allāh and will not be rightly guided because safety and guidance are confined to those people only who do not commit any kind of *ẓulm*. But this argument is not correct because it is based on the hypothesis that sins are meant by the word *Ẓulm* here, whereas it is clearly mentioned in the above *Ḥadīth* that *ẓulm* here means *shirk* only and does not include sins other than *shirk*. This *Ḥadīth* which is narrated by Imām Bukhārī and Imām Muslim is quite correct. Some people have minimised the importance of this *Ḥadīth* by saying that it is *Khabar-i-Wāḥid* (i.e. a *Ḥadīth* which is narrated by one person only). But it should be noted here that this kind of *Ḥadīth* is rejected only when it conflicts with the verses of the Holy Qur'ān or with a more reliable *Ḥadīth*, otherwise it is quite acceptable. Zamakhsharī says that this *Ḥadīth* conflicts with the Qur'ānic verse and none can mean *shirk* by the word *Ẓulm*. The mingling of *Īmān* and *shirk* is simply impossible because the two terms are antitheses as opposite terms and they cannot co-exist in the same place and at the same time. So what purpose does this *Ḥadīth* serve when it is admitted that *Īmān* and *shirk* can never meet in one place? Though the *Ḥadīth* is recorded both in Bukhārī and Muslim and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself has explained it, the Mu'tazilites hold that they can not accept that *Ḥadīth* which is contrary to the Qur'ānic verse and which is against the dictates of reason.

The commentators of the Qur'ān have paid the Mu'tazilites in the latter's own coin, (i.e. they have replied to the latter in their own terms). The substance of this reply is that Mu'tazilites maintain that *Īmān* is a combination of belief and work so much so that negation of work (*'amal*) necessitates negation of *Īmān* also, and they also hold that a man by committing a major sin becomes a disbeliever. The result will be that two antitheses (two opposite things) namely, *Īmān* and *Kufr* will meet together in the same place, according to the Mu'tazilites, and this is impossible. Hence, the Qur'ānic verse does not serve any useful purpose, if the word *ẓulm* means sin only.

The Mu'tazilites cannot say that *Īmān* is located in heart and sins in other parts of body because this discrimination can be justified if it is believed that *'amal* (work) is not part of *Īmān*, but certainly not, in case it is maintained, as it is done by the Mu'tazilites, that *'amal* is part of *Īmān*. As they hold that *'amal* is an essential part of *Īmān* like *Taṣdīq* (confirmation) and *Iqrār* (confession), *Īmān* will be located not only in heart, but in heart, tongue and other parts of body as well. Therefore, the location of *Īmān* and sins in the same place and at the same time means meeting of two opposite things in the same place and at the same time. This is certainly absurd.

If the Mu'tazilites say that the literal meaning of the word *Īmān* is intended here i.e. confirmation by heart, and it is located in heart, and this can exist with sins which are located in different parts of body, then we can also say the same thing, namely, the literal meaning of *Īmān* is taken here (i.e. *Taṣdīq* by heart) and *shirk* (antithesis of *Īmān*) cannot exist with it. Now the meaning of the Qur'ānic verse will be as follows: Those people who believe that Allāh exists and He is the Creator and Sovereign of the Universe and do not ascribe any kind of partnership to Him are safe and rightly guided. They must not, therefore, believe that though Allāh is the Mightiest and Greatest, there are subordinate gods (like officials of a State) who have some control over the world—just as the pagans of 'Arabia believed in Allāh being the Creator and Supreme Being, but at the same time worshipped deities and idols, who, according to their theory, shared the creative powers of Allāh. This is a plain and open *shirk* (polytheism). Further, the people must not follow the Jews and Christians who believe in the unity and supremacy of Allāh and also take as lords their *rabbīs* and monks besides Allāh, particularly, in respect of legislative matters. In short, if a person does not give up *shirk* of all types, his *Īmān* will not be genuine according to the religion of Islam and he will not be safe and he will not be rightly guided. The meaning of the Qur'ānic verse is now as clear as day light.

The Mu'tazilites must note that the Holy Qur'ān itself has combined *Īmān* and *shirk* together, as under:

And most of them believe not in
Allāh except that they attribute partners
(unto Him). (Qur'ān, 12:106)

وَمَا يُؤْمِنُ أَكْثَرُهُمْ بِاللّٰهِ إِلَّا وَهُمْ
مُّشْرِكُونَ ۝ (يوسف آيت ١٠٦)

The Qur'ān does not use the word *ẓulm* here but *shirk* which indicates that many people combine *Īmān* and *shirk* together (here the interpretation of the Mu'tazilites is quite untenable). The meaning of verse is that there are many people who believe that Allāh is Creator and Supreme, and at the same time, believe in semi-gods who share the Divine powers of Allāh (as the pagans of 'Arabia did), or attribute partners to Allāh as the Jews and Christians do by taking their *rabbīs* and monks as lords beside Allāh.

Apart from the above-quoted *Ḥadīth*, the Qur'ānic verse "الذين آمنوا ولم يلبسوا" must be read with reference to the context.

In the preceding verses Allāh says:

Say (O Prophet): Shall we cry, instead of unto Allāh, unto that which neither profiteth us nor hurteth us. (Qur'ān, 6:71)

قُلْ اَنَدْعُوْا مِنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ مَا لَا يَنْفَعُنَا وَ لَا يَضُرُّنَا، (انعام، آیت ٧١/٦)

This verse emphatically refutes polytheism (*shirk*). It is further strengthened by reference to an (anecdote) of Ḥaḍrat Ibrāhīm (Prophet Abraham, may peace be on him), as under:

(Remember) when Abraham (Ibrāhīm) said unto his father Azar: Takest thou idols for gods? (Qur'ān, 6:75)

وَاِذْ قَالَ اِبْرٰهِيْمُ لِاَبِيْهِ اٰزَرَ اَتَتَّخِذُ اَصْنَامًا اٰلِهَةً ج (انعام، آیت ٧٥/٦)

Afterwards the Qur'ān mentions the well-known argument which Ḥaḍrat Ibrāhīm (may peace be on him) advanced in support of unity of Allāh. His people argued with him about *Tauḥīd* (oneness of Allāh). Then he (Ḥaḍrat Ibrāhīm) asks them:

Dispute ye with me concerning Allāh when He hath guided me? I fear not at all that which ye set up beside Him. (Qur'ān, 6:81)

اَتُحَاجُّوْنِّیْ فِی اللّٰهِ وَقَدْ هَدٰىنِ وَلَا اَخَافُ مَا تُشْرِكُوْنَ بِهٖ ، (انعام، آیت ٨١/٦)

Further, Prophet Ibrāhīm (may peace be on him) said to his people:

How should I fear that which ye set up beside Him (Allāh), when ye fear not to set up beside Allāh that for which He hath revealed unto you no warrant? (Qur'ān, 6:81)

كَيْفَ اَخَافُ مَا اَشْرَكْتُمْ وَلَا تَخَافُوْنَ اَنَّكُمْ اَشْرَكْتُمْ بِاللّٰهِ مَا لَمْ يُنَزِّلْ بِهٖ عَلَيْكُمْ سُلْطٰنًا ط (انعام، آیت ٨١/٦)

After that Prophet Ibrāhīm silenced them by:

Which of the two factions hath more right to safety? (Answer me that) if ye have knowledge. (Qur'ān, 6:82)

فَاَیُّ الْفَرِيْقَيْنِ اَحَقُّ بِالْاَمْنِ ج اِنْ كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُوْنَ ۝ (انعام، آیت ٨٢/٦)

Prophet Ibrāhīm (may peace be on him) frankly told his people that as he was a staunch believer in unity of Allāh he naturally deserved peace and security more than the people who relapsed into idolatry and set up partners to Allāh. Peace is an antithesis of fear. When Ḥaḍrat Ibrāhīm (may peace be on him) was safe on account of belief in *Tauḥīd*, his opponents who were polytheists must have fear and apprehension in their lot. Two factions were engaged in debates, viz. (i) Prophet Ibrāhīm who invited his people to unity of Allāh and (ii) the peolpe who freely indulged in idolatry. Now the question is "which of the two factions hath more right to safety?" Allāh, the Most Exalted, replied to it as follows:

Those who believe and obscure not their belief by wrong-doing, theirs is safety; and they are rightly guided. (Qur'ān, 6:83)

اَلَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَلَمْ يَلْبِسُوْا اِيْمَانَهُمْ بِظُلْمٍ اُولٰٓئِكَ لَهُمُ الْاَمْنُ وَهُمْ مُّهْتَدُوْنَ ۝ (انعام، آیت ٨٣/٦)

Thus there is no getting away from the conclusion that the word *ẓulm* in the above verse has only one meaning, i.e. *shirk*—and no other meaning can be appropriate here.

Supposing, for an argument's sake, that the word *ẓulm* in the Qur'ānic verse means sins and not polytheism, even then the claim of the Mu'tazilites is not established because safety may be of two kinds, viz. (i) safety from entry into Hell and (ii) safety from perpetual residence therein. The Mu'tazilites can prove their case only when they say with certainty that the word "امن" (safety) in the Qur'ānic verse "اولئک لهم الا من" (i.e. theirs is safety) is confined to safety from perpetual residence in Hell only. In this case, the meaning of the verse will be that "the Believers who did not obscure their belief by committing sins, will not be safe from entry into Hell". But the Mu'tazilites are not sure about their interpretation of the word "امن" (safety), because it is quite possible that safety may mean safety from entry into Hell. In this case, a person, after committing sins, (not *shirk*) will not be safe from going to Hell. This is our view also, but it is against the Mu'tazilites' contention which is difficult to prove.[1]

CHAPTER XXIV

Signs of a hypocrite

32. We have been told by Sulaymān Abul Rabī' who said that he was informed by Ismā'īl bin Ja'far who said Nāfi' bin Mālik bin Abī 'Āmir Abū Suhayl narrated via his father that he (Mālik bin Abī 'Āmir) heard :

✶ Abū Hurayrah says:

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "There are three signs of a hypocrite, viz (i) when he speaks he speaks falsely (ii) when he promises he violates his promise and (iii) when he is entrusted with anything, he betrays his trust.

33. We have been told by Qabīṣah bin 'Uqbah who said that he was informed by Sufyān via al-A'mash via Abdullāh bin Murrah via Masrūq that he (Masrūq) heard 'Abdullāh bin 'Amr bin al-'Āṣ say:

✶ The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "Whosoever has four habits is a hypocrite, pure and simple. If he has one of them, he will have one sign of hypocrisy, until he gives it up. (They are)—(i) When he is entrusted with anything, he betrays his trust (ii) when he speaks, he speaks lies (iii) When he promises, he breaks his promise; and (iv) When he quarrels he abuses (and uses vulgar language).

Shu'bah has also narrated this *Ḥadīth* from al-A'mash along with Sufyān.

بَابٌ 24 عَلَامَةِ الْمُنَافِقِ

32 - حَدَّثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ أَبُو الرَّبِيعِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا إِسْمٰعِيلُ بْنُ جَعْفَرٍ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا نَافِعُ بْنُ مَالِكِ بْنِ أَبِي عَامِرٍ أَبُو سُهَيْلٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ آيَةُ الْمُنَافِقِ ثَلٰثٌ إِذَا حَدَّثَ كَذَبَ وَإِذَا وَعَدَ أَخْلَفَ وَإِذَا اؤْتُمِنَ خَانَ ؛

33 - حَدَّثَنَا قَبِيصَةُ بْنُ عُقْبَةَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا سُفْيَانُ عَنِ الْأَعْمَشِ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ مُرَّةَ عَنْ مَسْرُوقٍ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ عَمْرٍو أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ أَرْبَعٌ مَنْ كُنَّ فِيهِ كَانَ مُنَافِقًا خَالِصًا وَمَنْ كَانَتْ فِيهِ خَصْلَةٌ مِنْهُنَّ كَانَتْ فِيهِ خَصْلَةٌ مِنَ النِّفَاقِ حَتّٰى يَدَعَهَا إِذَا اؤْتُمِنَ خَانَ وَإِذَا حَدَّثَ كَذَبَ وَإِذَا عَاهَدَ غَدَرَ وَإِذَا خَاصَمَ فَجَرَ تَابَعَهُ شُعْبَةُ عَنِ الْأَعْمَشِ ؛

Imām Bukhārī means to say that hypocrisy has degrees like *Īmān* and *kufr*. In this *Ḥadīth* signs of hypocrisy are described. A person's hypocrisy will vary according to the number of the signs he has. If a man has more of them he will be a worse hypocrite than the one who has less. It is clear that hypocritical and insincere acts adversely affect *Īmān*, and this refutes the theory of the Murji'ah sect. Further the *Ḥadīth* says that hypocrites must give up signs of hypocrisy but does not say that they must recite *Kalima-i-Shahādat* in order to renew their religion. Hence, the belief of the Khāwrijites and Mu'tazilites are falsified. In this *Ḥadīth*, the expression of نفاق دون نفاق has not been used like كفر دون كفر and ظلم دون ظلم because 'Aṭā' bin Abī Ribāh originally used such sentences for three things only, viz. "كفر دون كفر" "disbelief below disbelief", "ظلم دون ظلم" wrong-doing below wrong-doing" and "فسق دون فسق" "sins below sins". Though Imām Bukhārī has not used such sentences, he means the same thing.

---

[1] The Arabic idiom "دونه خرط القتاد" means that it is easier to combine thorns (*Qatād* is a tree full of thorns) than to prove the contention of the Mu'tazilites. Further when there are two possibilities in the meaning of a word, the whole argument falls through.
'Abdur Raḥmān

It may be noted that in the first *Ḥadīth* three signs of hypocrisy are mentioned and in the second *Ḥadīth*, four. This shows that the signs of hypocrisy are not to be limited to three. It is corroborated by the fact that the phrase من آية المنافق is used in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* instead of آية المنافق and the word من gives the sense of some. Thus the signs of hypocrisy may be three or four.

Imām Muslim has narrated this *Ḥadīth* in the chapter on "Characteristics of a hypocrite". Generally three signs of hypocrisy are described but this does not limit the number to three. Qurṭabī says that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) might have first known three signs of hypocrisy only and afterwards he knew one more sign thereof. Some scholars say that if we combine both the *Aḥādīth* we shall get five signs viz. falsehood, treachery, breach of promise, violation of agreement and quarrels (with use of vulgar language), but they can be compressed in three, because "فجور" "quarrel with use of vulgar language" comes within "كذب" "falsehood" whereas "وعده خلافى" "i.e. breach of promise" and "عهد شكنى" "violation of agreement" convey almost the same meaning.

"When a man speaks, he speaks lies." When this اِذَا حَدَّثَ كَذَبَ becomes habit, it is a sign of hypocrisy, otherwise, speaking a lie once or twice is not so.

"When a man makes a promise he breaks it." وَاِذَا وَعَدَ اَخْلَفَ Violation of promise is *makrūh* (a very bad thing) according to our view. Some scholars call it almost unlawful and others call it undesirable.

Imam Ghazali's discourse on breach of promise

Imām Ghazālī says that if a person does not intend at the time of making promise that he will fulfil it, he is really a cheat and his act will be *Makrūhi taḥrīmī* (very bad, almost unlawful). If a person intends at the time of making promise that he will fulfil it but cannot do it on account of carelessness or laziness, then this act will be ***Makrūhi Tanzīhī*** (bad and undesirable). If a man intends to fulfil his promise and tries to do so, but on account of some unforeseen circumstance he cannot do it, he is not blamable.

Differences between "وعد" and "ايعاد" should be noted. "وعد" "i.e. promise" is used for good or evil, provided that good or evil is mentioned. If good or evil is not mentioned, it will generally mean good. The word "ايعاد" "to threaten" is used for evil only. The word "وعد" is some time used for evil also (for threat) as the Holy Qur'ān says :

The devil promiseth you destitution.
(Qur'ān, 2:268)

اَلشَّيْطَانُ يَعِدُكُمُ الْفَقْرَ (بقره، آيت ٢٦٨)

What has been said above regarding breach of promise, relates to the breach of such promises as are good. As regards threat, it must not be fulfilled if it involves any unlawful action. In any case, it is better not to implement any threat as a poet has said :

When I threaten him or make promise to him, I drop my threat and fulfil my promise.

وَاِنِّيْ اِذَا اَوْعَدْتُهٗ اَوْ وَعَدْتُهٗ

One point should be borne in mind. There is substantial difference between breach of promise (mentioned in the first *Ḥadīth*) and violation of agreement (mentioned in the second *Ḥadīth*). The former is sometimes undesirable and sometimes not so, but the latter is admittedly illegal if the agreement is not against the teachings of Islam.

كَانَ مُنَافِقًا خَالِصًا

Whosoever had the above four signs, is a hypocrite, pure and simple. There is an objection here. All the four signs relate to work (not to belief) and according to the *Ahlul Sunnat wal Jamā'at* (Muslims of the Sunī sect), none can be a disbeliever on the basis of his work. Several answers have been given. Firstly, these are the signs of hypocrisy, but they do not prove it (hypocrisy) with certainty. When one thing is known, it is not necessary that the other thing is also known. After all, signs are only helpful in knowing the identity of a person. For example, a man notifies that his son having such and such marks, is missing but these marks may be found in other boys as well. Similarly, clouds are indications of rains, but very often the atmosphere is thickly clouded but no rain falls. Hence the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) simply says that such and such habits are signs of hypocrisy, but he does not mean that those who possess them are certainly hypocrites. Secondly, hypocrisy in work, is under discussion and not hypocrisy in belief. The former is not *kufr* (disbelief) and the latter is so, even more.

Difference between hypocrisy in work and hypocrisy in belief

Nifāq (Hypocrisy) literally means that the external aspect of a person or thing is different from the internal. For example, "يربوع" (Jerboa) name of an animal outwardly has one hole only, but inwardly has another hole, which is not generally known. When a hunter enters the external hole to catch it, it gets out by another hole stealthily, escaping the notice of the hunter. In 'Arabic dictionary the "نافقاء" is the hole of Jerboa. It is also said that it has several holes inside the house. The word *nifāq* used in Islam is derived from it.

Qurṭabī and Bayḍāwī are of the opinion that a person is practically a hypocrite to the extent he has the characteristics of hypocrisy.

A hypocrite professes the religion of Islam outwardly but in his heart he is out of it (Islam), as the Qur'ān says.

And when they meet those who believe, they say : "We believe."
(Qur'ān, 2:14)

وَاِذَا لَقُوا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا قَالُوْٓا اٰمَنَّا (بقره آيت ١٤)

On the other hand, internally they betray Islam, when Qur'ān says:

But when they go apart to their devils they declare: Lo! we are with you; verily we did but mock. (Qur'ān, 2:14)

وَاِذَا خَلَوْا اِلٰى شَيٰطِيْنِهِمْ قَالُوْٓا اِنَّا مَعَكُمْ
اِنَّمَا نَحْنُ مُسْتَهْزِءُوْنَ ۝ (بقره، آيت ١٤)

Nifāq (hypocrisy) has two forms, viz (i) Internal and (ii) External. The former means that a man's mind is full of infidelity, hostility and mischief, but he shows that he is a Muslim in theory as well as in pracrice. This was the condition of the hypocrites during the time of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). This sort of *nifāq* is called *nifāq* in *'Aqīdah* (belief) and this is clearly the worst type of *kufr* (disbelief), as the Qur'ān says: "Verily, the hypocrites are in the lowest deep of Fire". The latter type of *nifāq* indicates that a person is really a Muslim and his beliefs are also correct, but he indulges in sins and misdeeds. This is *nifāq* in *'amal* (work). This is not *kufr* (disbelief) but *fisq* (sinfulness)-vide *Fatḥal Mulhim*, vol. I, page 234.

Īmān, *fisq* **and** *nifāq* **according to Shah Waliullah**

Shāh Waliullāh writes in his book "Ḥujjatullāhil Bālighah": As the mission of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was intended for whole mankind, the people of various categories accepted it. Then it was necessary to differentiate among them as to who were genuine Muslims and who were not, and who followed the *sunnat* of the Prophet, heart and soul and who were Muslims in name only. So the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has described several kinds of *Īmān*. Further Shāh Ṣāḥib says: "That *Īmān* which is the basis of salvation and attainment of ranks in the Hereafter is a combination of all kinds of genuine beliefs, good deeds and noble habits".

Thus *Īmān* consists of three things, viz. confirmation by heart, good deeds and noble habits. If any body is devoid of belief (i.e., confirmation by heart) and surrenders to Islam under duress, his hypocrisy will be pure and unmixed.

There will be no difference between such hypocrites and disbelievers on the Day of Judgment.

If a person believes by heart, but does not follow the teachings of Islam (i.e. he commits crimes some times), he is *fāsiq* (a sinner).

وَاِنْ كَانَ مُفَوِّتًا لِوَظِيْفَةِ الْجَوَارِحِ سُمِّيَ فَاسِقًا ۔

Afterwards Shāh Ṣāḥib says: "If there is no sincerity of heart, it will be a kind of *nifāq* which early Muslim scholars called *nifāq* (hypocrisy) in work. This sort of *nifāq* is generated when a man becomes a victim of his evil nature, anti-social and anti-religious practices. He is completely absorbed in his love for his children, family and the world at large, with the result that he begins to think that the rewards and punishments of the Hereafter are remote and far off, and is prompted to commit sins though he accepts those things which are actuated by reason and intellect."

From the above discourse of Shāh Waliullāh, it is evident that, if misdeeds are committed occasionally and they do not become a man's regular habits they are called *fisq* (sin), and if they become regular habits and good work is not done (e.g. a man always speaks lies) then such acts are called *nifāqi 'amalī* (i.e. hypocrisy in action). The third reply is that the above expression applies to pure hypocrisy and hypocrisy of disbelief, but here it means resemblance with hypocrites. The Believers must avoid it, so that the people may not look down upon them with suspicion. Because, when a Believer adopts the habits of a hypocrite, and his acts become like those of a hypocrite, he resembles hypocrites. Thus to express something which does not tally with what one has in mind is *nifāq* (hypocrisy), and this particular *nifāq* concerns the persons who commit falsehood, breach of promises or betrayal of trusts, etc. Such persons are not *Munāfiq* in relation to Islam; they are so called because they have some habits of hypocrites.

The fourth reply is that the ***Ḥadīth*** in question, is a kind of warning to the people in order to keep them away from immoral acts. In another ***Ḥadīth*** the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is reported to have said that "traders are wicked and most hypocrites of my community are *Qārīs* (reciters of the Qur'ān)". Obviously, this ***Ḥadīth*** does not mean that all traders are wicked and many reciters of the Qur'ān are hypocrites. The chief purpose of this ***Ḥadīth*** is that the traders (and others) must stop speaking lies and the *Qārīs* must recite the Qur'ān sincerely from the core of their hearts and not for the sake of formality or convention (i.e. there must not be any show of recitation of the Qur'ān). The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) intended to raise the moral standard of his followers by giving them this warning. The ***Ḥadīth*** of the chapter also aims at the same thing i.e. the word *nifāq* has been used to warn the people against committing misdeeds and immoral acts. In short, the Prophet's warning is meant for those people who have made misdeeds their habits and not for those persons who act wrongly by chance or accident.

The Qur'an and characteristics of a hypocrite

It is reported that the Companions of the Prophet found it difficult to grasp the real meaning of the ***Ḥadīth*** about hypocrites. Ḥaḍrat Sa'īd bin Jubayr who was very much grieved, referred the matter to Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Umar and Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās. They replied: O our nephew! We had also been grieved, and we asked the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) about it. He smiled and said, "You have nothing to do with these characteristics which concern hypocrites." When we referred to the ***Ḥadīth*** "When he spoke lies," he said: This applies to the people who are described in the Qur'ān as follows :

When the hypocrites come unto thee (O Muḥammad), they say: We bear witness that thou art indeed Allāh's Messenger. And Allāh knoweth that thou art indeed His Messenger, and Allāh beareth witness that the hypocrites are speaking falsely. **(Qur'ān, 63:1)**	اِذَا جَآءَكَ الْمُنٰفِقُوْنَ قَالُوْا نَشْهَدُ اِنَّكَ لَرَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ ۘ وَاللّٰهُ يَعْلَمُ اِنَّكَ لَرَسُوْلُهٗ ؕ وَاللّٰهُ يَشْهَدُ اِنَّ الْمُنٰفِقِيْنَ لَكٰذِبُوْنَ ۚ (منافقون آیت ۱)

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) asked: "Are you like them?" We replied in the negative. "Then you have no fear and you are quite safe", said the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). When we referred to the ***Ḥadīth***, "When he made a promise he broke it", the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said: This relates to the following verse of the Qur'ān :

And of them is he who made a covenant with Allāh (saying): If He gives us of His bounty we will give alms and become of the righteous. Yet when He gave them of His bounty, they hoarded it and turned away, averse. (Qur'ān, 9:75-76)	وَمِنْهُمْ مَّنْ عٰهَدَ اللّٰهَ لَئِنْ اٰتٰىنَا مِنْ فَضْلِهٖ لَنَصَّدَّقَنَّ وَلَنَكُوْنَنَّ مِنَ الصّٰلِحِيْنَ ۞ فَلَمَّآ اٰتٰىهُمْ مِّنْ فَضْلِهٖ بَخِلُوْا بِهٖ وَتَوَلَّوْا وَّهُمْ مُّعْرِضُوْنَ ۞ (توبہ، آیت ٧٥، ٧٦)

In other words, the people promised to Allāh that, if He was pleased to confer favours on them, they would give alms in the way of Allāh. But when He did it, they turned away and broke their convenant. Though this verse was revealed in connection with Tha'labah bin Ḥāṭib, it applies to all those people who make promises and then break them. Tha'labah requested the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) to pray to

Allāh for increase in his wealth. He said: "O Tha'labah! Something for which you thank Allāh is better than lots of things whose dues you cannot pay". He repeated his request, and the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said: "O Tha'labah! Do you not like that you follow in my footsteps?" Anyhow, he insisted and told the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) that, if Allāh gave him wealth, he would fulfil all obligations. The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) prayed for Tha'labah and the result was that the flock of his sheep increased in abundance and he had to reside in a village outside Madīnah. He neglected prayers and when collector of *zakāt* went to him to collect *Zakāt*, he refused to pay saying that Jizyah (tax paid by non-Muslims in an Islamic state in lieu of their exemption from *Zakāt* and also in consideration of their protection against dangers) was a sister of *Zakāt*. Three times the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) expressed regret for his refusing *Zakāt*. Then the above verse of the Qur'ān was revealed. On the persuation of his relatives, Tha'labah went to the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) with *Zakāt*, but he said that Allāh had forbidden him to accept his *Zakāt*. After the Prophet's death, he came to Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr, Ḥaḍrat 'Umar and Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān with *Zakāt*, but all of them rejected it, saying that they could not accept what the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) had refused to accept. Tha'labah died during the reign of Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān, while he continued his habit of hypocrisy. After the above two verses, the following verse was revealed:

So He hath made the consequence (to be) hypocrisy in their hearts until the Day when they shall meet Him, because they broke their word to Allāh that they promised Him, and because they lied.
(Qur'ān, 9:77)

فَأَعْقَبَهُمْ نِفَاقًا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ إِلَىٰ يَوْمِ
يَلْقَوْنَهُ بِمَا أَخْلَفُوا اللَّهَ مَا وَعَدُوهُ وَبِمَا كَانُوا
يَكْذِبُونَ ○ (توبہ، آیت ۷۷)

Thus Allāh punished him (Tha'labah) for his falsehood and breach of promise with the result that *nifāq* (hypocrisy) was firmly rooted in his heart and he continued a *munāfiq* till the end of his life. Now if a man adopts good or bad habits and continues them for a considerable time, they become part of his nature. This is what is meant by *Sunnati Allāh* (i.e. method or tradition of Allāh).

Afterwards the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said that the sentence, "When anything is entrusted to him he violates it" relates to the following verse of the Qur'ān.

Lo! We offered the trust unto the heavens and the earth and the hills, but they shrank from bearing it and were afraid of it. And man assumed it. Lo! he hath proved a tyrant and a fool.
(Qur'ān, 33:72)

إِنَّا عَرَضْنَا الْأَمَانَةَ عَلَى السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْأَرْضِ
وَالْجِبَالِ فَأَبَيْنَ أَنْ يَحْمِلْنَهَا وَأَشْفَقْنَ مِنْهَا وَ
حَمَلَهَا الْإِنْسَانُ ۖ إِنَّهُ كَانَ ظَلُومًا جَهُولًا ○ (احزاب، آیت ۷۲)

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is reported to have said that every Believer is a trustee of his religion. He takes bath after impurity, offers prayers and observes fast publicly as well as privately. Hypocrites do these things only to show. He then asked Ibn 'Umar and Ibn 'Abbās, "Are you like them (i.e., hypocrites)?" They replied in the negative. Then the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) told them, "you have no fear because the above *Ḥadīth* does not concern you." Thus it is clear that the Qur'ān's description of characteristics of hypocrites coincides with the Prophet's description of the sign of *nifāq* (hypocrisy).

Philosophy behind three signs of hypocrisy

According to some scholars, this *Ḥadīth* is one of *Jawāmi' al-Kalim*, i.e. it is encyclopaedic in its meaning and import. Human activities may be classified into three, viz. (i) speech (ii) work and (iii) motive. If these three activities of a man are in good order, he is quite safe, otherwise, he will be a loser. The sentence, "When he speaks, he speaks lies" indicates something wrong in respect of speech, and the clause, "When anything is entrusted to him he violates the trust," shows some mischief in his work, and the expression, "When he makes a promise he breaks it", denotes his bad motive. If a person has to break his promise under compulsion or has not intended to do so, then he will not be called a hypocrite. Ṭabarānī has endorsed this view by narrating a long *Ḥadīth* from Ḥaḍrat Salmān to the effect that if a man makes a promise but he intends in his heart that he will break it, then he will be a hypocrite.

Reason for not calling a Muslim a hypocrite

Some scholars say that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said the above *Ḥadīth* in relation to a particular individual and notorious hypocrite. It was the usual custom of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) that whenever he desired to point out the defects or bad habits of any person, he did not name him specifically, but he referred to his habit in general terms in order to reform the entire Muslim community and guard them against the evil habits that were found in some persons. In this way the Prophet's discourse presents a complete code of life to be followed by all Muslims.

According to some scholars, those hypocrites are referred to, in the *Ḥadīth*, who, during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم), claimed to be Muslim but were not so, who were made trustees of Faith but were treacherous and who promised to support Islam but did not fulfil their promise. On such occasions, the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) did not specify the weak points of any particular person or group of persons, but simply said: What will be the condition of the people who do so and so? (vide '*Umdat al-Qārī* Vol. I, page 221-222).

Hasan Basri's change of view

In early times, Muslims never hesitated in changing their view if they were convinced that it was wrong. Ḥasan Baṣrī, whose eminence as a scholar, was admitted by Qatādah, A'mash, Abū Zur'ah, Muḥammad bin Sa'd and others, changed his previous view regarding the meaning of *munāfiq*. It is reported that Ḥasan Baṣrī once said: I do not find any harm in calling that person *munāfiq* (hypocrite) who has three habits, namely, 'when he speaks, he speaks lies', 'when he makes a promise, he breaks it' and 'when anything is entrusted to him, he violates the trust'. A certain person related Ḥasan Baṣrī's view to 'Aṭā' who told him: When you go to Ḥasan Baṣrī, give him my *salām* and tell him to remember the story of the brothers of Prophet Yūsuf (Joseph)[1] and realise that Allāh has not created those habits in the mind of any Muslim, and so *nifāq* cannot apply to a person who has *Īmān* in his heart. The Qur'ānic verse, "That is because they believed, then disbelieved," (Qur'ān 63:3) evidently means that the hypocrites under reference had not really believed. Hence no Muslim can be called a hypocrite, only on the ground that he has the signs of *nifāq*. When

---

[1] The brothers of Ḥaḍrat Yūsuf spoke falsely and committed breach of promise and violation of trust. But inspite of these three signs, they cannot be called hypocrites. They were Believers though they intended to monopolise their father's affection for themselves to the exclusion of Ḥaḍrat Yūsuf, so that they could get reward and favours from their father. Doubtless, they followed a wrong line of action but they were not hypocrites.

'Aṭā's message reached Ḥasan Baṣrī, the latter was pleased, thanked the former and changed his former opinion. Further, Ḥasan Baṣrī told his pupils that if the learned scholars differed with his view on any subject, they should communicate their opinions to him positively.

In short, Muslims must abstain from all signs of hypocrisy, but it is not correct to call him *munāfiq*, because the expression, "حتى يدعها" "until he gives them up" indicates that it is enough for a Muslim to remove those habits. If a Muslim had become a *munāfiq* as a result of the signs of *nifāq*, the expression such as, "until he believes" or "renews his belief" would have been used.

اِذَا خَاصَمَ فَجَرَ 'When he quarrels, he abuses'. The word "فجور" means use of vulgar language or indecent expression.

تَابَعَهُ شُعْبَةُ Shu'bah, in narrating this *Ḥadīth* from A'mash, follows Sufyān Thaurī. This *Ḥadīth* is narrated by Qabīṣah, but Yaḥyā bin Mu'īn calls Qabīṣah via Sufyān a weak narrator. Hence it has been added that there is another narrator also (viz. Shu'bah).

CHAPTER XXV

The worship on the *Laylatul Qadr* (Night of Power or Decrees) is part of Faith.

34. We have been told by Abul Yamān who was informed by Shu'ayb who said: Abul Zinād narrated via A'raj that he (the latter) heard:

✶ Ḥaḍrat Abū Hurayrah says:

The Holy Prophet of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "Whosoever worships Allāh on the Night of Power with *Imān* and intends to attain Allāh's favours, will have all his past sins forgiven."

بَابٌ ٢٥ قِيَامُ لَيْلَةِ الْقَدْرِ مِنَ الْإِيْمَانِ

34- حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْيَمَانِ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا شُعَيْبٌ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الزِّنَادِ عَنِ الْأَعْرَجِ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مَنْ يَّقُمْ لَيْلَةَ الْقَدْرِ إِيْمَانًا وَّ احْتِسَابًا غُفِرَ لَهُ مَا تَقَدَّمَ مِنْ ذَنْبِهٖ ۞

The chapter on "spreading of *Salām*" was the last chapter regarding beliefs. Now in this *Ḥadīth* the Night of Decree has been referred to. There is one *Ḥadīth* to the effect that Jibra'īl (Gabriel) and a group of angels come down to the earth and *salām* the Believers who are engaged in offering prayers and reciting the Qur'ān on the *Shabi Qadr* (Night of Decrees or Power). The Holy Qur'ān says:

The angels and the Spirit (i.e. Jibra'īl) descend therein, by the permission of their Lord, with all decrees. (That night is) Peace until the rising of the dawn.
(Qur'ān, 97:4-5)

تَنَزَّلُ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةُ وَالرُّوْحُ فِيْهَا بِإِذْنِ رَبِّهِمْ ۚ مِنْ كُلِّ أَمْرٍ ۛ سَلٰمٌ ۛ هِيَ حَتّٰى مَطْلَعِ الْفَجْرِ ۝ (قدر، آيت ٤-٥)

With the permission of Allāh Ḥaḍrat Jibra'īl (Holy Spirit) and a large number of angels come down to the earth to favour the Believers with a variety of blessings and rewards. From the above *Ḥadīth* it is clear that Jibra'īl and other angels who *salām* the Muslims, engaged in offering prayers and reciting the Qur'ān on *Shabi Qadr*, really pray to Allāh for their safety and salvation.

Now what connection is there between this chapter and the previous chapter on signs of hypocrisy. The answer is that blessings of *Shabi Qadr* depend on one's *Īmān*, sincerity and good work, and as hypocrisy is antithesis of *Īmān*, *munāfiq* cannot attain them. Again, in the previous chapter, signs of hypocrisy were enumerated and, in this chapter, signs of belief are described.

Laylat al-Qadr

The Holy Qur'ān was revealed in the month of Ramaḍān: "The month of Ramaḍān in which was revealed the Qur'ān. (Qur'ān 2:185)

From reliable *Aḥādīth* it transpires that the Night of Powers or Decrees should be searched in the last ten days of Ramaḍān, particularly on the odd nights of the last ten days of the month (and the most probable night is the 27th of Ramaḍān). Many scholars are of the opinion that *Laylatul Qadr* is not fixed for any particular night of Ramaḍān. It may vary from year to year. Now, if the word *Qadr* in "ليلة" means decree, then the meaning of the above-quoted verse will be that on the night, Allāh's decrees (regarding all events that will take place during the whole year) are brought down to the earth from "لوح محفوظ" (a Guarded Tablet) through Ḥaḍrat Jibra'īl and other angels. If *Qadr* in "ليلة القدر" means honour and power, the meaning of the Qur'ānic verse will be that this night is the most honourable and most powerful of all nights of the year and, consequently, Believers' prayers, recitation of the Qur'ān and other kinds of worship on this night will bear more favours and rewards in Hereafter than the same done on other days and nights.

"If a person worships مَنْ يَقُمْ لَيْلَةَ الْقَدْرِ إِيمَانًا وَّاحْتِسَابًا غُفِرَ لَهُ مَا تَقَدَّمَ مِنْ ذَنْبِهِ ؛ Allāh on the Night of Decrees or Power with *Īmān* (sincere belief) and intends to attain Allāh's favours, then all his past sins will be forgiven". The word "قيام" (from which يقم a verb of the future tense is derived), literally means to stand. Here it means to get ready for worshipping Allāh, as the Qur'ān says :

O thou enveloped in thy cloak. Arise and Warn. Thy Lord magnify.
(Qur'ān, 74:1-3)

يَاأَيُّهَا الْمُدَّثِّرُ قُمْ فَأَنْذِرْ وَرَبَّكَ فَكَبِّرْ (المدثر آيت ۱-۳)

Commentators of the Qur'ān are generally of the opinion that the word *Īmān* in the above *Ḥadīth* is used in its general sense (viz Belief) and the word *Iḥtisāb* means to seek to obtain rewards. The *Ḥadīth* stresses two points here (i) A person must be Muslim, because no worship of a non-Muslim is accepted and (ii) one must worship with good motive, because bad intentions waste all kinds of worship. But, as far as I understand, the words of *Īmān* and *Iḥtisāb* used in this *Ḥadīth*, convey some thing more, namely, it is not enough that one should be Muslim and has good intentions but it is also necessary that these two factors (*Īmān* and *Iḥtisāb*) must be the stimulating cause of prayers and other good deeds. In other words, when a person worships Allāh and does other praiseworthy work., these two points *Īmān* and *Iḥtisāb* must be invariably present in his mind. His prayers and good work must not be matters of formality but outcome of his sincere belief and intentions to obtain Allāh's rewards. It is our every day's experience that we offer prayers and recite the Qur'ān, etc., as we perform our official or formal duties without attending to them seriously and sincerely. Though we have belief and our motive is also good, yet, when we actually work, they get out of our minds. Our whole work becomes a fuss or show or ceremony. This point may be explained by an example. A doctor prescribes some medicine for his son who is his favourite and tells him, "My dear son! If you use this medicine regularly every day, you will recover very soon and I shall give you some rewards also". The son, after using the medicine for some days, gets accustomed to it and then like a machine, he goes on using it without thinking of his father's pleasure or his regards. Exactly, this is the case of our prayers, fast, etc., now-a-days. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) emphasizes the point that in all our actions, our chief guiding factors must be our *Īmān* and good motive, so that Allāh may be pleased to confer His favours on us in abundance.

The verb "يقم" in the *Ḥadīth* is in the future tense, whereas the same idea is expressed by the verb "قام", of the past tense, in connection with fasting during the month of Ramaḍān. This difference may be on account of difference in the narration of the same *Ḥadīth*. If, however, difference is found in the words of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself, then it may be due to the fact that the month of Ramaḍān is fixed, so a verb of the past tense has been used, whereas the Night of the Decrees is not fixed, hence a verb of the future tense has been used.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that difference in Abū Hurayrah's *Aḥādīth*, (mentioned in the verbs of the subjunctive mood) is generally due to difference in the versions of the same. For example, the word "يقم" "which is antecedent" in the *Ḥadīth* is a verb of the future tense and "غفرله" "which is consequence" is a verb of the past tense. In Nisā'ī, a *Ḥadīth* is narrated by Abū Hurayrah in these words: "i.e. Whosoever worships Allāh on the Night of the Decrees, will have his sins forgiven".

CHAPTER XXVI

Jihād (Holy War) is part of *Imān*:

35. We have been told by Haramī bin Hafs who was informed by 'Abdul Wāḥid bin Ziyād who said: 'Umārah told us that Abū Zur'ah bin 'Amr bin Jarīr said that he heard ;

✶ Hadrat Abū Hurayrah says:

The Prophet of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said : Whosoever participates in *Jihād* (Holy War) in the way of Allāh and nothing causes him to do so except belief in Allāh and His Prophets, will be favoured by Allāh either with rewards or booty (if he survives) or will be admitted to Paradise (if he is martyred in the war). Had I not found it hard for my community, I would not have remained behind any battle and I would have loved to be killed in the way of Allāh and then to be revived and again to be killed and then to be revived and again to be killed (in the cause of Allāh).

بَابٌ 26 اَلْجِهَادُ مِنَ الْإِيْمَانِ

35 - حَدَّثَنَا حَرَمِيُّ بْنُ حَفْصٍ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا
عَبْدُ الْوَاحِدِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا عُمَارَةُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا
أَبُوْ زُرْعَةَ بْنُ عَمْرِو بْنِ جَرِيْرٍ قَالَ سَمِعْتُ أَبَا هُرَيْرَةَ
عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ انْتَدَبَ
اللّٰهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ لِمَنْ خَرَجَ فِيْ سَبِيْلِهِ لَا يُخْرِجُهُ إِلَّا
إِيْمَانٌ بِيْ وَتَصْدِيْقٌ بِرُسُلِيْ أَنْ أُرْجِعَهُ بِمَا نَالَ مِنْ
أَجْرٍ أَوْ غَنِيْمَةٍ أَوْ أُدْخِلَهُ الْجَنَّةَ وَلَوْلَا أَنْ أَشُقَّ
عَلٰى أُمَّتِيْ مَا قَعَدْتُ خَلْفَ سَرِيَّةٍ وَلَوَدِدْتُ
أَنِّيْ أُقْتَلُ فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ ثُمَّ أُحْيٰى ثُمَّ أُقْتَلُ
ثُمَّ أُحْيٰى ثُمَّ أُقْتَلُ ؞

Jihād is of two kinds viz. (i) *Jihād* with self and (ii) *Jihād* with disbelievers. The former leads to unconditional surrender to Allāh and unqualified obedience to His commandments and prohibitions. The latter kind of *Jihād* really rests on the former, because when a person tries to subordinate all his desires and passions to the will of Allāh, he can do it also by fighting with those who disbelieve in Allāh. It is obvious that when a man sacrifices himself in the cause of Allāh, all evil passions, such as greed, avarice, selfishness, bloodshed etc. will disappear from his mind.

This chapter on *Jihād* is part of *Īmān* is preceded by the chapter on "worship on the Night of Decree is part of *Īmān*," and succeeded by chapter on "Worship during the month of Ramaḍān is part of *Īmān*". Thus Imām Bukhārī stresses the point that *Jihād* with disbeliever depends on *Jihād* with one's own self. If one can fight successfully with one's own self (by subordinating all desires to the will of Allāh), one can fight with pagans all the more, successfully. The Holy Qur'ān emphasises that fighting with self should be undertaken before participating in a battle with unbelievers, as under :

Hast thou not seen those unto whom it was said: Withhold your hands, establish worship and pay the poor-due. (Qur'ān, 4:77)	اَلَمْ تَرَ اِلَى الَّذِيْنَ قِيْلَ لَهُمْ كُفُّوْٓا اَيْدِيَكُمْ وَاَقِيْمُوا الصَّلٰوةَ وَاٰتُوا الزَّكٰوةَ ج (نساء، آيت ٧٧)

The Muslims were tortured by the pagans of 'Arabia before migration to Madīnah and they requested the Holy Prophet's permission to fight with the enemies of Islam, but he dissuaded them from doing so and insisted on their offering prayers, paying poor-dues etc. The chief object of the Prophet was to prepare his followers to make all sorts of sacrifice in life, money, etc., before they were fit to wage war against the disbelievers. The Qur'ān says:

O ye who believe! Be mindful of your duty to Allāh, and seek the way of approach unto Him, and strive in His way. (Qur'ān, 5:35)	يٰٓاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللّٰهَ وَابْتَغُوْٓا اِلَيْهِ الْوَسِيْلَةَ وَجَاهِدُوْا فِيْ سَبِيْلِهٖ (مائده آيت ٣٥)

Ibn 'Abbās, Mujāhid, Abū Wā'il, Ḥasan and some other scholars are of the opinion that the word "وسيله" (*Wasīlah*) in the Qur'ānic verse means approach or nearness. So the meaning of the verse will be that one must try to approach Allāh by adopting good manners, decent life and lawful professions and by abstaining from those deeds which incur the displeasure of Allāh. All these practices are included in *Jihād* with self. There is one ***Ḥadīth*** to the effect that *Wasīlah* is a very high position (or destination) in Paradise which some persons will procure. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is also reported to have said: "Pray to Allāh after *Adhān* that He may be pleased to confer that *Wasīlah* (position) on me." This high position is near to Divine Throne "عرش". It is obvious that when we like to reach the destination we must cross all the hurdles that are in the way and pass through various stages. Hence Allāh first commands the Believers to fear Allāh and then directs them to seek a way of approach to Allāh. This is the meaning of "وجاهدوا في سبيله" (And make efforts in the cause of Allāh). In a few verses before this verse, the Qur'ān has described the wickedness and disobedience of the Jews as follows: "(Prophet Moses said), O my people! Go into the holy land which Allāh hath ordained for you. Turn not in flight, for surely ye turn back as losers." (Qur'ān 5:21) ...They (the Jews) said: O Moses! We will never enter (the land) while they (the enemy) are in it. So go thou and thy Lord and fight! We will sit here (Qur'ān 5:24).

Anyhow, when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) described the merits and rewards of *Jihād*, his Companions requested his permission to wage war against disbelievers, as they had already made *Jihād* against themselves and punctually offered prayers and paid *zakāt* (poor-dues) and did other good deeds:

انْتَدَبَ اللّٰهُ لِمَنْ خَرَجَ فِيْ سَبِيْلِهٖ لَا يُخْرِجُهٗ اِلَّا اِيْمَانٌ بِيْ وَتَصْدِيْقٌ بِرُسُلِيْ Allāh has assumed this responsibility that if a person goes out for *Jihād* in the way of Allāh, and nothing causes him to do so except belief in Him and His Apostles, Allāh will give him rewards or booty (if he survives) or admit him to Paradise (if he is killed) in *Jihād*. The word *Intadaba* in the *Ḥadīth* means to accept something quickly. In another version, the word *Takaffala* replaces *Intadaba*, and both the words convey the same meaning.

This ***Ḥadīth*** does not mention the quantity (or quality) of rewards. Abū Dā'ūd has narrated a ***Ḥadīth*** to the effect that if a participant of

Jihād returns home with booty it will mean that he has got two-third of rewards due to him, and the remaining one-third will be reserved for the Day of Judgment. If any *Mujāhid* (i.e., who joins *Jihād*) does not get any booty, then his entire rewards will be paid to him on the Day of Judgment. There is apparently some conflict between Bukhārī's *Ḥadīth* and Abū Dā'ūd's, because according to the former booty and full rewards are payable in this world whereas according to the latter two-third of rewards are payable here. Abū Dā'ūd's *Ḥadīth* is correct in my opinion. Anyhow, the object of the *Ḥadīth* is to stress the point that a participant in *Jihād* always achieves rewards and glory, and if he is killed during *Jihād* he is a martyr.

The same idea is expressed in the following verse of the Qur'ān:

Say: Can ye await for us aught save one of two good things (Death or victory in Allāh's way)? While we await for you that Allāh will afflict you with a doom from Him or at our hands. Await then! Lo! we are awaiting with you.
(Qur'ān, 9:52)

قُلْ هَلْ تَرَبَّصُونَ بِنَا إِلَّا إِحْدَى الْحُسْنَيَيْنِ
وَنَحْنُ نَتَرَبَّصُ بِكُمْ أَنْ يُصِيبَكُمُ اللّٰهُ بِعَذَابٍ
مِّنْ عِنْدِهٖ أَوْ بِأَيْدِينَا فَتَرَبَّصُوا إِنَّا مَعَكُمْ
مُّتَرَبِّصُونَ ۝ (توبہ، آیت ۵۲)

In the preceding verse of the Qur'ān, it has been said that the enemies of Islam are grieved if the Muslims are in a favourable position and rejoice if the latter are in disaster, and Allāh directed His Apostle to announce: The Believers have full trust in their Creator Who is all in all, and whatever He decides would be in favour of them (Believers). In this verse it is said: Whatever comes from Allāh—pleasure or sorrow, is welcome to us (Muslims) and we are awaiting the day when Allāh will afflict the enemies of Islam with His doom or He may enable us to punish them. We, the Muslims, have surrendered to Allāh unconditionally, and we obey His commands whole heartedly. In such circumstances, the disbelievers must assume that we, the Believers, will have one of two alternatives, viz. if we are killed in the cause of Allāh we shall be martyred and go to Paradise, and if we return safely we shall get rewards or spoils of war. A question arises here. "Reward" and "Booty" (war spoils) are not contrary terms. May a participant in *Jihād* (Holy War) obtain rewards in all cases—whether he gets booty or not. Why, then, is "او" (or) which is conjunction used in the above *Ḥadīth*? Mawlānā Syed Anwar Shāh Ṣāḥib says that the use of conjunction "او" (meaning or) in the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter does not necessarily indicate that the two things connected by "or" are contrary to each other. The conjunction letter here signifies this much only that the two things have separate applications, though they may happen together. The conjunction letter "او" (or) may be used between the "follower" and the "followed" as they are two different things. Rewards follow war-spoils in case of a participant of *Jihād*.

Qurṭabī says that the expression "من اجر او غنيمة" (Reward or booty) is an abridged form of "من اجر فقط او اجر غنيمة" (Reward only or reward and booty).

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) وَلَوْلَا أَنْ أَشُقَّ عَلَى أُمَّتِي مَا قَعَدْتُ خَلْفَ سَرِيَّةٍ says: If I did not find it hard for my community, I would not remain behind any '*Sarīyah*.' *Sarīyah* generally means an army consisting of about 400 soldiers. If it exceeds that number it is called "جيش" (Jaysh) etc. Hardship referred to, in the *Ḥadīth* may indicate that a good deal of work at Madīnah was affected during the Prophet's absence from the town. It may also indicate that it is not necessary for every Head of State to participate in wars personally, because, in that case, lots of necessary work regarding administration and other things shall have to be suspended. Further, this *Ḥadīth* affords some consolation to the poor people who could not join *Jihād* on account of poverty and lack of necessary provision (They realised that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) also could not join *Jihād* for some consideration or the other).

The Holy Qur'ān says:

> Nor unto those whom, when they came to thee (asking) that thou shouldst mount them, thou didst tell: I cannot find whereon to mount you. They turned back with eyes flowing with tears, for sorrow that they could not find the means to spend. (Qur'ān, 9:92)
>
> وَلَا عَلَى الَّذِينَ إِذَا مَا أَتَوْكَ لِتَحْمِلَهُمْ قُلْتَ لَا أَجِدُ مَا أَحْمِلُكُمْ عَلَيْهِ تَوَلَّوا وَّأَعْيُنُهُمْ تَفِيضُ مِنَ الدَّمْعِ حَزَنًا أَلَّا يَجِدُوا مَا يُنفِقُونَ ۝ (التوبہ، آیت ۹۲)

As a result of the Prophet's company, the Muslims were immersed in their love of Allāh, the like of which is not found in the history of any community or country. Their sacrifices in the cause of Allāh were incomparable and unparalleled. The rich and well-to-do Muslims placed all their possessions at the disposal of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in time of need without any hesitation whatsoever, whereas the poor and needy Muslims with tears in their eyes regretted their inability to participate in *Jihād*. According to a reliable *Ḥadīth*, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) addressed the *Mujāhidīn* (those who joined *Jihād*) saying: you have left behind at Madīnah some persons who share your rewards at every step and who accompany you wherever you go in the cause of Allāh, but straitened circumstances stand in their way. It is recorded in a *Ḥadīth* of Ḥasan that after this address, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) recited the above-quoted verse. It cannot be gainsaid that the poor Muslims, who were anxious to join *Jihād* but could not do so on account of inability or lack of transport, etc., were awfully grieved to know that the Holy Prophet with many Companions was taking part in Holy war but they could not. One of the objects of the Prophet's non-participation in *Jihād* was his compassion and sympathy for the helpless Muslims who, despite all their efforts, could not fight against disbelievers. All those battles which the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) attended personally are called "Ghazwāt" and other battles are called "Sarāyā".

"I would love to be killed in the way of Allāh." لَوَدِدْتُ أَنِّي أُقْتَلُ فِي سَبِيلِ اللهِ
It may be said here that every Apostle of Allāh is superior to a martyr. Why, then, did the Head of Apostles wish to share the rank of less eminent persons? The answer is that on some occasion, a superior being desires to occupy the position of an inferior being for some consideration. For example, sometimes, a person, after partaking of rich and delicious food, desires to take some ordinary things just for change of taste Moreover, the Holy Prophet's wish to participate in *Jihād* was not really to obtain the position or reward of a martyr. The chief object of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was to sacrifice his life in the way of Allāh, and in doing so he found special pleasure.

"Then I would love to be alive, and ثُمَّ أُحْيَى ثُمَّ أُقْتَلُ ثُمَّ أُحْيَى ثُمَّ أُقْتَلُ
then martyred, and then made alive and then martyred." This passage indicates that the Prophet's love for martyrdom was so very intense that he repeatedly liked to sacrifice himself in the way of Allāh, as

many times as possible. However high the position of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) might be, martyrdom in the cause of Allāh, has glory and eminence of its own. Allāh loves the martyrdom of His servants, so His Apostle loves to obtain it as often as practicable.

A martyr goes to Paradise immediately

The special privilege of a martyr is that he will go to Paradise immediately after his soul goes out of his body. All Believers will, sooner or later, go to Paradise but after their work here is scrutinised by the Divine authorities. A martyr enjoys this special privilege that he will be sent to Paradise without any delay and his deeds will not be checked. The Holy Qur'ān relates the story of a Believer as follows:

> Coin for them a similitude: The people of the city when those sent (from Allāh) came unto them. When We sent unto them twain, and they denied them both, so We reinforced them with a third, and they said: Lo! we have been sent unto you.
> (Qur'ān, 36:13-14)

وَاضْرِبْ لَهُمْ مَّثَلًا اَصْحٰبَ الْقَرْيَةِ ۘ اِذْ جَآءَهَا
الْمُرْسَلُوْنَ ۚ اِذْ اَرْسَلْنَآ اِلَيْهِمُ اثْنَيْنِ فَكَذَّبُوْهُمَا
فَعَزَّزْنَا بِثَالِثٍ فَقَالُوْٓا اِنَّآ اِلَيْكُمْ مُّرْسَلُوْنَ ۝
(یٰسٓ، آیت ۱۳،۱۴)

Most commentators of the Qur'ān say that the city referred to, in this verse was Antocio, that Ibn Kathīr differs with them on historical grounds and also on account of the fact that their view is out of context. Anyhow, two Apostles of Allāh (or deputies of any Apostle) went to the people of the city to guide them on the right path. They denied them, and then another Prophet was sent to them but they denied. The Qur'ān says: (They said)

> Ye are but mortals like unto us. The Beneficent hath naught revealed. Ye do but lie. (Qur'ān, 36:15)

مَآ اَنْتُمْ اِلَّا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُنَا ۙ وَمَآ اَنْزَلَ الرَّحْمٰنُ
مِنْ شَيْءٍ ۙ اِنْ اَنْتُمْ اِلَّا تَكْذِبُوْنَ ۝ (یٰسٓ، آیت ۱۵)

According to commentators of the Qur'ān, the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was instructed by Allāh to relate the above event to the pagan 'Arabs in order to convince them that their theory that man could not be an Apostle of Allāh was totally wrong. As a matter of fact, a divinely gifted man, endowed with particular merits, could (and did) perform the duties of an Apostle of Allāh more efficiently than any member of other species could do.

At last a man from the suberbs of the town came as the Qur'ān says:

> And there came from the uttermost part of the city a man running. He cried : O my people! Follow those who have been sent. (Qur'ān, 36:20)

وَجَآءَ مِنْ اَقْصَا الْمَدِيْنَةِ رَجُلٌ يَّسْعٰى ز
قَالَ يٰقَوْمِ اتَّبِعُوا الْمُرْسَلِيْنَ ۝ (یٰسٓ، آیت ۲۰)

Habib Najjar's martyrdom

A good man, named Ḥabīb *Najjār*, tried his utmost to explain the teachings of the Apostles to his people in order to remove all kinds of polytheism from their minds and guide them on the path of Allāh. But all his words fell on deaf ears. At last he announced his own acceptance of Islam in these words :

> Lo! I have believed in your Lord, so hear me! (Qur'ān, 36:25)

اِنِّيْٓ اٰمَنْتُ بِرَبِّكُمْ فَاسْمَعُوْنِ ۝ (یٰسٓ، آیت ۲۵)

This man (Ḥabīb Najjār) who was a strong monotheist, did his best to make his people worship one Allāh. But they were so much immersed into polytheism that they paid no heed to what he preached, and at last they put him to death mercilessly. It is narrated by Ḥaḍrat

'Abdullah bin Mas'ūd that he was tortured with barbarity and savageness. The doom of Allāh (in the form of a Shout) fell on the people of the city who were destroyed within the twinkling of an eye. Before his death he requested the Apostles to bear witness that he accepted Islam. He also asked his people to hear him and follow his advice. He was sent to Paradise, as the Qur'ān says :

It was said (unto him) : Enter Paradise. He said: Would that my people know. With what (munificence) my Lord hath pardoned me and made me of the honoured ones. (Qur'ān, 36:26-27)

قيل ادخل الجنة قال يليت قومي يعلمون بما غفر لي ربي وجعلني من المكرمين (یٰس، آیت ۲۷)

According to *Aḥādīth* the souls of all martyrs are sent to Paradise as soon as they (souls) leave their bodies.

It may be added here that the Holy Prophet's wish for martyrdom produced similar wish in the hearts of his Companions. To desire martyrdom is also some sort of martyrdom. Abū Dā'ūd says that many people die in their beds, and still they get rewards of martyrdom. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) intended to generate in the hearts of his Companions an ardent desire to sacrifice their lives, wealth and every thing in the cause of Allāh. The Qur'ān says :

Lo! Allāh hath bought from the Believers their lives and their wealth because the Garden will be theirs. (Qur'ān, 9:111)

ان الله اشترى من المؤمنين انفسهم واموالهم بان لهم الجنة (التوبہ، آیت ۱۱۱)

It may be said that continuous desire for martyrdom implies that a section of people will continue to be disbelievers till the end of the world, because *Jihād* (holy war) is always made against disbelievers.

There is a *Ḥadīth* in Abū Dā'ūd (Vol. I, page 350).

Jihād will continue till the Day of Resurrection.

الجهاد ماض الى يوم القيمة، (ابوداؤد شریف ص۳۵۰ ج۱)

In short, the Holy Prophet's wish for martyrdom (not once but several times) really enhances the importance and excellence of *Jihād*, and stresses the point that not one life but thousands of lives ought to be sacrificed in the way of the Divine Being.

CHAPTER XXVII

It is a part of one's faith to offer supererogatory prayers (*Namāz-i-Nawāfil*) during the nights of Ramaḍān.

باب 27 تطوع قيام رمضان من الايمان

36. It was narrated to us by Ismā'īl who had it from Imām Mālik who had heard it from Ibn Shihāb who, in turn, heard it from Ḥumayd bin 'Abd al-Raḥmān who heard it from :

✱ Abū Hurayrah that the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said : "Whoever, during the month of Ramaḍān (in the nights) out of faith and sincerity offers prayers for blessings shall have his earlier sins pardoned."

36 حدثنا اسمعيل قال حدثني مالك عن ابن شهاب عن حميد بن عبد الرحمن عن ابي هريرة ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال من قام رمضان ايمانا واحتسابا غفر له ما تقدم من ذنبه ۞

Relevancy with objective

There are two schools of thought having observance as a part of Faith. One school believes that only obligations *Farā'iḍ* are a part of faith, while the other school includes both obligatory prayers and supererogatory prayers as parts of the faith. Imām Bukhārī here has alluded to the belief of the second school by means of the additional word, تطوع, that is, doing a good action which one is not obliged to perform. The word تطوع implies *tarāwīḥ* prayers particularised with Ramaḍān nights. The holy nights of the month of fasting are those that manifest the Grace and Beneficence of God and one way of deriving benefit from them is to offer *trāwīḥ* which are the least degree in تطوع. There are other modes of prayer e.g., *tahajjud*[1], *nawāfil*, recitation, pronouncing of blessings and recitation of the Qur'ān. All these fall under تطوع in accordance with their respective degrees, and utmost advantage should be taken of all these, during these moments of Grace. War in the path of God followed the establishment of *Laylatul Qadr* (the night of power). This has been succeeded by prayer of the establishment of Ramaḍān. The arrangement of the chapters shows that all these acts demand exertions in devotion, and this can be achieved by only one who is endowed with love and sincerity in God.

Remission possible only when nothing repugnant to it

God the Almighty has promised remission under certain conditions.

1. Whoever observes (*Laylat al-Qadr*) with sincere faith, for reward taking stock of his preceding sins, shall have remission therefor.
2. Whoever establishes Ramaḍān with sincere faith, taking stock of his preceding sins, shall have remission therefor.
3. Whoever observes Ramaḍān with sincere faith, taking stock of his preceding sins, shall have remission therefor.

The fact is that remission or pardon is an attribute of the observances and fasting in Ramaḍān for the whole month of Ramaḍān.

In order to gain the attribute of a thing, it is but essential that the latter should not have an object in it that would be inhibitory in this respect. The property of a drug depends upon the absence of a property that would be inhibitory in this respect. How much a drug is used, the presence of an inhibitory factor would detract it from being effective. The above observances, by virtue of their attributes, are sufficient to warrant remission of earlier sins, provided there is nothing militating against such remission.

In these narrations and others of the kind, these attributes are especially mentioned so that man might cultivate within himself an inclination and predilection towards them and cultivate abstinence and abhorrence for all acts contrary to them. God has, through these limited subservient acts and observances bearing association with limited and particular span of time, opened the Floodgates of His unlimited Mercy. Virtuous acts do have the capacity of being substituted for penance. If there are no sins, the ranks of a man would be raised higher.

Attributes of acts

Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan explains the attributes or characteristics of acts as follows: Let us understand it on the analogy of different simples that are collected inasmuch as they are useful in the treatment of an ailment when, however, all the simples are woven into a compound drug, the temperament of the individual drug would depend upon the part, the characteristic of which would predominate. Some simples, for example, are hot, others, cold, and again some dry and some wet in their effect.

---

[1] A form of Prayers repeated during the night.

We can interpret observances or acts on this analogy. Some would draw us towards reward and others towards punishment. Our whole life is cast on this pattern, and the electuary in consonance with the temperament of a person is in the course of preparation till his last breath. It is his last temperament which predominates when he dies. He would go to Hell if it is the sinful aspect that predominates. If piety, prayers, and obedience to the Commands of God predominate, his overall temperament would be heavenly. The result of the acts performed during life would depend upon the dominant part.

CHAPTER XXVIII

Fasting, in the month of Ramaḍān with the motive of reward, is a part of faith.

37. We have been told by Muḥammad bin Salām Bekandī who was informed by Muḥammad bin Fuzayl who heard from Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd who heard from :

✻ Abū Hurayrah who said :

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: Whosoever fasts in the month of Ramaḍān with belief and motive of reward, all of his past sins would be foregiven.

باب 28 صوم رمضان احتسابا من الإيمان

37 ـ حدثنا ابن سلام قال أخبرنا محمد بن فضيل قال حدثنا يحيى ابن سعيد عن أبي هريرة قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من صام رمضان إيمانا واحتسابا غفر له ما تقدم من ذنبه ٭

A dubiety to the arrangement of chapters

Here the question arises as to why Imām Bukhārī has chosen to discuss 'fasting in Ramaḍān' afterwards, although fasting is obligatory, and the establishment of Ramaḍān has preceded. The *tarāwīḥ* prayers are supererogatory and therefore fasting in Ramaḍān ought to have had precedence over the establishment of Ramaḍān. How were supererogatory prayers placed before the obligatory prayers ?

The answer generally given in favour of this arrangement is that, of the different aspects of Ramaḍān, the first act is the establishment of fasting, as, after the sighting of the Ramaḍān moon, *tarāwīḥ* prayers are offered at night and fast kept in the morning. What precedes by way of act is therefore kept prior to description. Another point advanced in favour of this approach is that, from the point of view of time, night has precedence over day and the association of the establishment of Ramaḍān is with night. Still another reply that has followed is that supererogatory prayers at night herald the approach of fasting and the convention is that prolegomena or the introduction precedes the actual act. Some exegetes have said Imām Bukhārī has suggested the path of the *sunnah*, as it is the way of acceptability.

Allāh has made obligatory upon you the observance of fasts and I have made for you the estab'ishment of Ramaḍān as the prayers conducted by me.

فرض الله عليكم صيامه وسننت لكم قيامه ـ

Nocturnal prayers during the establishment of Ramaḍān have also been accorded precedence, since fasting is the kind of renunciation or abstinence, whereas *Tarāwīḥ* constiutes actual acts, and the latter as acts, have been made to gain precedence over what has been abstained from. It is perhaps because of this, that Imām Bukhārī has not used the word, *Iḥtisab* (self-assessment). In such an event as the present, the state of knowledge itself is sufficient to warrant self-assessment by way of description. But the apparent aspect of fasting is not instructive. Imām Bukhārī has therefore mentioned fasting in Rāmaḍān along with *Iḥtisab*.

The *Aḥādīth* have described several acts with the promise of pardoning sins. One *Ḥadīth* has it that, if the worshipper says *Āmeen*, at the end of the *Sūrah Fātiḥah*, and if the *Āmeen* synchronises with that, offered by the angels, all the past sins shall be washed away.

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, "Prayers five times a day washe away the vice of sins, and from one ablution to the next one, and from one Friday prayer to the next, the detergence of all sins has been promised". The period from one Ramaḍān to the next and from one *'Umrah* to the succeeding one also has been ordained as an act of penance, and one *Ḥadīth* has made the tenth day of *Moḥarram* ('āshūrā) as penance for sins committed during one year. The promise of absolution from sins, through prayers offered during the fasting in Ramaḍān, establishment of Ramaḍān and *Laylat al-Qadr* is contained in these chapters.

Dubiety

When several acts are attributed to the promise of absolution of sins and if one act is enough to cause the pardon of sins, what would the remaining acts of goodness be for?

Explanation

'Allāmah Nawawī, 'Allāmah Qasṭalānī, and Ḥāfiẓ Badr al-Dīn 'Aynī have said in their exegeses of the Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī that, once an act of goodness has washed away the past sins of the person then the remaining acts would be counted as his virtues instead of penance of past sins and the ranks of the person would be raised higher.

Some have said the degrees of remission are different, and remission progresses with the degrees. A stage approaches when this remission becomes his carrier to a very high position. Some scholars have said that even if the person has committed a major sin, it is not vain to hope, considering the unbounded Beneficence of the Almighty, that God would reduce intensity of his culpability. Nawawī has said that the general opinion of the exegetes is that the *Aḥādīth* which promise forgiveness for past sins, imply the minor and not the major sins. This is why when some acts were associated with forgiveness for sins of the past, it was also enjoined that the major sins should be abstained from. For instance, the pardon for sins through ablution carries the qualification, 'ولم يؤت كبيرة' i.e. unless he commits major sins and 'ما اجتنب الكبائر' i.e. until and unless he is immune to the commission of major sins. This supports the general view prevalent among the exegetes. 'Allāmah Qasṭalānī believes that, although there are *Aḥādīth* having words that qualify the nature of the minor sins, in most of the *Aḥādīth*, the general applicability of expiation for sins of the past cannot be ruled out. *Aḥādīth* having general applicability carry pardon for both major and minor sins. The All-Comprehending Beneficence of God can forgive major sins, and therefore all the *Aḥādīth* that are absolute in nature are held to include both kinds of sins. But this cannot mean that expiation or penance for major sins should be observed negligently.

It is necessary for a man to seek forgiveness from the parties concerned, from whom, he has taken money by foul means and debts and has incurred other obligations, if he is not in a position to reimburse them. In case, the desired pardon is not sought, salvation in the Hereafter would be affected. When in the next world, he would himself require good deeds for his salvation, he will have to part with his virtuous deeds for the settlements of his liabilities. On the one hand, the number of good deeds is small and there is no surity whether all of them would be acceptable. And, if the accepted acts are transferred to the claimants, the person, taken to account, shall face a crucial fate. May God save us from such a situation. It is therefore advisable to be careful not to neglect penitence of the major sins.

CHAPTER XXIX

RELIGION OF ISLAM IS EASY TO FOLLOW

The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "God has great liking for a religion that is straightforward, truthful and easy (to fol'ow)."

38. It was narrated to us by 'Abd al-Salām bin Muṭahhar who had it from 'Umar bin 'Alī who had it from Ma'n bin Muḥammad Ghifārī who had it from Sa'īd bin Abī Sa'īd Maqburī when it was told by:

✶ Abū Hurayrah saying: The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "Indeed, (the religion of Islam) is easy to follow and the religion would dominate him whosoever tries to make it hard. So be moderate; and if you cannot do a job in a better manner, try to do it as properly as you can. Be happy in the hope of blessings. Take advantage of walking in the morning, evening and the later part of night (for relaxation).

بَابُ 29 اَلدِّيْنُ يُسْرٌ

قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اَحَبُّ الدِّيْنِ اِلَى اللّٰهِ الْحَنِيْفِيَّةُ السَّمْحَةُ ⁖

38 حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ السَّلَامِ بْنُ مُطَهَّرٍ قَالَ نَا عُمَرُ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ عَنْ مَّعْنِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدِ الْغِفَارِيِّ عَنْ سَعِيْدِ بْنِ اَبِيْ سَعِيْدِ الْمَقْبُرِيِّ عَنْ اَبِيْ هُرَيْرَةَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ اِنَّ الدِّيْنَ يُسْرٌ وَّلَنْ يُّشَادَّ الدِّيْنَ اَحَدٌ اِلَّا غَلَبَهٗ فَسَدِّدُوْا وَقَارِبُوْا وَاَبْشِرُوْا وَاسْتَعِيْنُوْا بِالْغَدْوَةِ وَالرَّوْحَةِ وَشَيْءٍ مِّنَ الدُّلْجَةِ۔

When one day I looked at the Qur'ān, it was confirmed that Imām Bukhārī had the Qur'ān in mind. Here the description of Ramaḍān precedes that of *Yusr* (ease).

The month of Ramaḍān in which was revealed the Qur'ān, a guidance for mankind, and clear proofs of the guidance, and the Criterion (of right and wrong). And whosoever of you is present, let him fast the month, and whosoever of you is sick or on a journey, (let him fast the same) number of other days. Allāh desireth for you ease. (Qur'ān 2:185)

شَهْرُ رَمَضَانَ الَّذِیْۤ اُنْزِلَ فِیْهِ الْقُرْاٰنُ هُدًى لِّلنَّاسِ وَبَيِّنٰتٍ مِّنَ الْهُدٰى وَالْفُرْقَانِ ۚ فَمَنْ شَهِدَ مِنْكُمُ الشَّهْرَ فَلْيَصُمْهُ ۗ وَمَنْ كَانَ مَرِيْضًا اَوْ عَلٰى سَفَرٍ فَعِدَّةٌ مِّنْ اَيَّامٍ اُخَرَ ۗ يُرِيْدُ اللّٰهُ بِكُمُ الْيُسْرَ، (البقرہ، آیت ۱۸۵)

No sooner had Imām Bukhārī started with his chapter on fast than he took this turn. As the word Yusr (ease) existed in the āyah, a separate chapter for this also was formed. He says that the religion liked most, is Ḥanīfīyah. The literary meaning of Ḥanīf is to be inclined. In the Qur'ān and the *sunnah* is one who renounces every thing and submits and resigns to God just as Ibrāhīm.

Lo! Abraham was of a people obedient to Allāh, by nature upright, and he was not of the idolaters... (Qur'ān 16:120)

اِنَّ اِبْرٰهِيْمَ كَانَ اُمَّةً قَانِتًا لِّلّٰهِ حَنِيْفًا ؕ وَلَمْ يَكُ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِيْنَ (النحل، آیت ۱۲۰)

And he therefore proclaimed:

Lo! I have turned my face toward Him Who created the heavens and the earth, as one by nature upright, and I am not of the idolaters. (Qur'ān 6:80)

اِنِّيْ وَجَّهْتُ وَجْهِيَ لِلَّذِيْ فَطَرَ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضَ حَنِيْفًا وَّمَاۤ اَنَا مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِيْنَ ۚ (انعام، آیت ۸۰)

That is to say, having dissociated myself from all that is created, I have sought the Threshold of God, exalted be His Name. He is the Master of all that is sublime and all that which is low.

از یکے گو وز ہمہ یکسوئے باش   یک دل ویک قبلہ ویک روئے باش

Recite the Name of One from whom all of us are, and to Whom we
are devoted with one heart, one direction (Qibla), one aspect.

This is a couplet from Shaykh Farid al-Dīn 'Attār's Mantiq al-Tayr (The Parliament of Birds). There are other verses of the same kind:

آں خداوندے کہ ہستی ذاتِ اوست ٭ جملہ عالم مصحفِ آیاتِ اوست

The whole world is the mirror of the manifestations
of God, Who is the Self-existence Being.

اُو زجملہ بیش وہم بیش از ہمہ ٭ جملہ از خود دیدہ و خویش از ہمہ

He is greater than all the creatures. But greater than this even.
The whole Universe came into being due to his attention.

جاں نہاں در جسمِ اُو درجاں نہاں ٭ اے نہاں اندر نہاں اے جانِ جاں

The soul is concealed in the body and God is concealed in it. Oh God! the soul of
life, Thou art concealed in the hidden things. (You are the source of all secrets)

چُوں نہاں بینی عیاں آنگہ شود! ٭ چُوں عیاں بینی نہاں آنگہ شود

If you conceive God concealed, He would reveal Himself. And if you see him revealed,
He would conceal Himself. (i.e. His manifestation and concealment are beyond you.)

در ہمہ بینی چو بےچوں است اُو ٭ آں زماں از ہر دو بیروں است او

As He is beyond example and if you see Him in that state, He would
be above those both state (manifestation and concealment)

The Prophet Ibrāhīm (Abrāham) has been called *Ḥanīf*, as he was the first of the monotheists and manifestations, of monotheism. What did he not renounce in the way of God? He forsook his home, father, homeland and his own people. He had only one Companion, the nephew of the Prophet Loot. He was then commanded to leave Ḥaḍrat Ismā'īl and Ḥaḍrat Hajrah in a valley on the border of an uncultivated plain. The *Ḥadīth* has that, when they were left there, Hajrah asked the Prophet whether he was leaving her at the Command of God. He said: "By the command of God". Then she said "Now you may go; no worry. Then there is a question of sacrifice. After how many prayers for years together she got a son! When Nimrod threw Ibrāhīm into fire, an angel asked to help him, he replied:

فَقَالَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ لَاحَاجَةَ لِيْ اِلَيْكُمْ
حَسْبِيَ اللّٰهُ وَنِعْمَ الْوَكِيْلُ (تفسیر روح المعانی ص۶۸ ج۱۷)

Then the Prophet Abrāham (in reply) said: "I have naught to do with thee. I have God and He is the Doer of what is best." (*Tafsīr Ruḥ al-Ma ānī*, Vol. 17, p-68)

In sum, he passed through all possible kinds of ordeals, and it is therefore said in the Book of God:

اِذْ قَالَ لَهٗ رَبُّهٗٓ اَسْلِمْ ۙ قَالَ اَسْلَمْتُ
لِرَبِّ الْعٰلَمِيْنَ ۝ (بقرہ، آیت ۱۳۱)

When his Lord said unto him: surrender! he said: I have surrendered to the Lord of the Worlds. (Qur'ān, 2:131)

This is what is known as *Ḥanīf*. The word has been employed in the Qur'ān only for Prophet Ibrāhīm and it has become his appellation. The word, *Ḥunafā* (orthodox believers) is found in the Qur'ān, but the word, *Ḥānīf*, has not been used exclusively for else than Prophet Ibrāhīm (Abrāham). The *millat* of Islam is called *Ḥanīfiah* because it is associated with him. (Ibrāhīm)

Imām Bukhārī says:

That is, the religion dearest to God is اَحَبُّ الدِّيْنِ اِلَى اللّٰهِ الْحَنِيْفِيَّةُ السَّمْحَةُ the religion that is *Ḥanīf*, the very foundation of which has been laid with ease and beneficence. While all the religions are from God and many are liked by him, but that which is dearest to Him is the religion of Abraham (Ibrāhīm), since its commands are moderate and easy to follow.

Those who follow the messenger, the Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) who can neither read nor write, whom they will find described in the Torah and the Gospel (which are) with them. He will enjoin on them that which is right and forbid them all which is wrong. He will make lawful for them all good things and prohibit for them only the foul; and he will relieve them of their burden and the fetters that they used to wear.
(Qur'ān, 7:156)

اَلَّذِيْنَ يَتَّبِعُوْنَ الرَّسُوْلَ النَّبِيَّ الْاُمِّيَّ
الَّذِيْ يَجِدُوْنَهٗ مَكْتُوْبًا عِنْدَهُمْ فِي التَّوْرٰىةِ وَ
الْاِنْجِيْلِ يَاْمُرُهُمْ بِالْمَعْرُوْفِ وَيَنْهٰهُمْ عَنِ
الْمُنْكَرِ وَيُحِلُّ لَهُمُ الطَّيِّبٰتِ وَيُحَرِّمُ عَلَيْهِمُ
الْخَبٰٓئِثَ وَيَضَعُ عَنْهُمْ اِصْرَهُمْ وَالْاَغْلٰلَ الَّتِيْ
كَانَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ (اعراف، آیت ۱۵۶)

Many harsh orders of prohibitions had been imposed on the Jews for their malpractices in food. Islam relaxed such conditions. All the prohibited things like flesh of swine or other evil things like usury etc. sanctioned in Judaism were made *ḥarām* (religiously prohibited) by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). It is these that are described in 'بعثت بالحنيفيه السمحة'. 'اصر' 'means burden or load', and 'والاغلال التى كانت عليهم' that is, the shackles with which (the people) were chained, have been broken. The implication thus is that hardships have been lifted and the religion has been made facile and easy to follow.

And strive for Allāh with the endeavour which is His right. He hath chosen you and hath not laid upon you in religion any hardship; the faith of your father Abraham (is yours). He hath named you Muslims of old time... (Qur'ān, 22:78)

وَجَاهِدُوْا فِي اللّٰهِ حَقَّ جِهَادِهٖ هُوَ اجْتَبٰكُمْ
وَمَا جَعَلَ عَلَيْكُمْ فِي الدِّيْنِ مِنْ حَرَجٍ مِلَّةَ اَبِيْكُمْ
اِبْرٰهِيْمَ هُوَ سَمّٰكُمُ الْمُسْلِمِيْنَ ۵ (حج، آیت ۷۸)

The word, *mujahidah*, (strenuous exertion against infidels in defence of faith) all kinds of strivings—bodily, oral, material, and written—and the different varieties of *jihād*—against the self, against *Saṭānic* powers, against the Infidels, against tyrants and conspirators against heretics—all are covered by it. As a matter of justice, whatever exertions we undergo in the course of our attaining permanent success in religion and eternal salvation in the next world, are comparatively less than the striving undergone in matters of worldly achievements because God's Beneficence upon us is great that He has vouchsafed to us the greatest and noblest Prophet, (صلى الله عليه وسلم) a *sha'rīah* that is the most complete and comprehensive of all, and He has chosen us to carry His Message to the whole world. He has conferred upon us superiority over all other *ummāhs*. He has not laid any condition of hardship that would be difficult for us to bear, and has allowed us all kinds of ease and exemptions. God, in fact, has called upon mankind as a whole to come to the fold of the *Ḥanīfiyah* (orthodox). The Qur'ān has:

And they are ordained naught else than to serve Allāh, keeping religion pure for Him... (Qur'ān 97:5)

وَمَآ اُمِرُوْٓا اِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوا اللّٰهَ مُخْلِصِيْنَ
لَهُ الدِّيْنَ ۵ حُنَفَآءَ (بیّنه، آیت ۵)

That is to say, dissociating themselves from aught but One God, they should admit themselves as the slaves of One Master just like Ibrāhīm.

Hanafiyyat, Judaism, and Christianity

Mawlānā Anwar Shāh says *Ḥanafiyyat* (i.e., Muslim orthodoxy) has been described alongside of Judaism and Christianity, and the Qur'ān has praised it in contrast with Judaism and Christianity:

> And they say: Be Jews or Christians, then ye will be rightly guided. Say (unto them, O Muḥammad). Nay, but (we follow) the religion of Abrāham, the upright, and he was not of the idolaters.
> (Qur'ān 2:135)

وَقَالُوْا كُوْنُوْا هُوْدًا اَوْ نَصٰرٰى تَهْتَدُوْا ۭ
قُلْ بَلْ مِلَّةَ اِبْرٰهٖمَ حَنِيْفًا ۭ (البقرہ، آیت ۱۳۵)

The Jews and the Christians have no answers to correct the firm objections of Islam. They are repeating their baseless claim that without Judaism or Christianity a man cannot be led along the path of guidance. It is a fact that, without following the creed of Prophet Abraham, man cannot be guided and Prophet Abraham was not a polytheist. Mawlānā Anwar Shāh says both Judaism and Christianity are revealed religions, but they were vitiated by the followers of these religions. So both Judaism and Christianity have come to be identified with the vitiated Torah and Bible. This is why *Ḥanafiyyat* has been juxtaposed against Judaism and Christianity. The Holy Prophet has said:

> I have been sent (as a messenger) of the *millat* of Abrāham. It is a religion so resplendent that for it the day and the night are equal.

بُعِثْتُ بِالْمِلَّةِ الْحَنِيْفِيَّةِ الْبَيْضَاءِ لَيْلُهَا
وَنَهَارُهَا سَوَآءٌ

The implication is that the real *millat* is the millat of Prophet Abraham. During the intervening period till the appearance of Islam, Judaism and Christianity were vouchsafed Commandments in keeping with their circumstances, till, at last the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was sent as the last Messenger of God on earth and as the bearer of the true (*Ḥanīf*) faith. His mission was to review and make the *millat* of Prophet Abraham flourish which due to negligence and unfounded additions and amendments had been spoiled so that all the sources of polytheism should be completely turned down.

Relevancy and the purpose of translation

Bukhārī, after the chapters relating to Ramaḍān, has written a chapter on ‘الدين يسر’ to cover the whole *āyah* ‘شهر رمضان فيه القرآن’. This has some bearing upon the *kitāb al-Īmān*, as from the words, ‘الدين يسر’ it would seem that there are some religions which are difficult to practise and follow. The religion of Islam is the easiest to follow and from this it is established that there are stages of pre-eminence in religion. According to observance in religion, there may be commandments involving rigidness and flexibility resulting in convenience and inconvenience in its comprehension.

In the previous chapters the establishment of the Night of Power, waging of war in the path of God, fasting (i.e., *tarawīh* prayers along with fasts during the day) have been discussed. All these observances involve exertions. Thus acts that require labour are present in Islam. If the acts involving strenuous labour, are resorted to, then every one would not be able to endure hardship resulting from such action. The result would be that, due to hardship experienced in any act, the intention to do the act would be loosened and the very spirit of the act would gradually end. In order, therefore, to save us from the misconception that Islam is a hard religion to follow, Imām Bukhārī has interpolated this chapter emphasizing that Islam is a religion of ease. He wishes to explain that all the obligations and observances described earlier do have the allowance of moderate tendency. No acts that the Muslims are enjoined to follow are such as to be beyond the pale of average human effort. It would therefore be wrong to believe that since such and such act is dear to God, it has to be performed, whatever the degree of hardship is caused to the performer. Bukhārī cautions us by suggesting that, if we undergo undue hardship caused by the performance of any deed, we would be tired. It is beyond you to dominate religion Hence the fear is baseless that the acts involving hardship would make the intentions weak and the spirit of action would be gradually over. Neither the hardship in action nor the justification of such a fear is warranted.

A question arises that when the foregoing acts involve hardship how is it reasonable to say that Islam is an easy religion ?

Our reply to such a question would be that the acts or obligations described in the foregoing chapters are those involving hardship and yet, if we cast a glance at the earlier religions, we would find that the religion of Islam is one of ease and of the least difficulty. If we compare the obligations prescribed in Islam with those of the earlier religions, we would find that the hardships involved in them have been considerably reduced in Islam. This is just ease in comparison with the earlier religions, but should we examine Islam realistically and objectively, we would find it to be nothing but ease.

Rewards far in excess in comparison with prayers

God has vouchsafed to His servants two concatenations: prayers and rewards. The former are the necessary obligations imposed upon the created ones to be observed in obedience to God, the Creator, whereas the concatenation of recompense is a never ending chain of God's Beneficence towards man, and is beyond all estimate.

Man, no doubt, is bound to observe prayers and commands but the concatenation of requital is in excess. And this excess is not due to His being governed by some copmulsion but because of His Bounty and Beneficence. When kept in "triple darkness" (*zulumatī thalāthah*),[1] nourishment was provided by Him and He made it possible for an embryo to become an infant so that after the birth of the child there should be no difficulty in the maintenance and sustenance of the child. Throughout his life, man was vouchsafed God's infinite Beneficence. When this chain of rewards is so great and indeed endless, we can easily see that the corresponding chain of prayers is far shorter and man can perform them at his personal convenience, although, considering the excess of his Beneficence, one would expect that the chain of prayers and obligations should be much longer. Well has a poet said about it :

شکرِ نعمت ہائے تو چندانکہ نعمتہائے تو   عذرِ تقصیراتِ ما چندانکہ تقصیراتِ ما

Thanksgiving for thine Boon is (like thanking Thee) for Thine limitless Boon.
And the excuses for my faults constitute even more faults.

---

[1] The three darkness—length, breadth, and depth—of the lower world; the triple darkness in which the Prophet Jonas was enveloped, namely, of night, of the fish's belly, and of the depth of the sea ; the impurities of natural disposition, selfishness, the darkness of the membrane enwrapping the embryo, of the womb, and of the mother's abdomen.

In fact, not even one moment should pass without praying to Him. If we compare our prayers with the rewards, the religion of Islam, in fact, is very easy. Prayers that are obligatory have been also made convenient and simpler. Of the twelve months in a year, only the month of Ramaḍān has been fixed for fasting. We can gauge the ease associated with Islam if we cast a glance over the commands, in respect of Ramaḍān. A very old and weak person on account of having lost his energy, has not been ordered to fast and ransom has been prescribed as a substitute for fasting. The sick have also been given the benefit of "فعدة من ايام اخر" "(let him fast the same) number of other days, 2:185". They can fast after they have recovered fully from illness. Pregnant and suckling women can also exercise the option of fasting the same number of days if they believe that either they or their children are likely to be adversely affected. Similarly, a traveller also can postpone his fasts, and make them up, later on.

In view of the convenience in respect of obligatory prayers, we have to pray only five times during twenty four hours a day and their timings have been quite widely spaced and they can be offered at one's convenience. Travellers and ailing persons have been provided with facilities: the sick can perform *tayammum* (using sand in place of water), and, if they cannot stand up, they can perform prayers sitting, and, if they are unable to do that, they can perform prayers in a recumbent position. The traveller can perform shortened prayers. *Muakkidah* (confirmatory) prayers have been made non-confirmatory (*ghayr muakkidah*). If one cannot dismount from a carriage for some reason, *rūkū*'[1] and *sujūd* (prostrations) can be performed by means of their symbols.

Zakāt to the extent of 1/40th of the wealth is due only If the person's wealth scales the prescribed ceiling and not otherwise. This amount should be the residue left over, after different expenses and debts have been disposed of, and it is spent on the needy and the indigent among his own people. This is as if *zakāt* is an amount spent on the satisfaction of one's own requirements.

Ḥajj is an obligation that is to be performed once within one's life time. It is for the rich only, it is not obligatory upon the poor. Again, even if one has the resources to perform *Ḥajj*, then there should be no obstruction in the way of its performance. *Jihād* is neither obligatory at all times nor on all persons. The *Nawāfil* are optional, if performed, they shall bring about requital, but, if left unperformed, the defaulter shall not be punished. They are volitional and voluntary, not demanded.

The Holy Prophet's words circumscribe all these aspects and we should closely study them :

The religion dearest to God is the *Ḥanīf* religion—a religion at the basis of which is case.

أَحَبُّ الدِّيْنِ إِلَى اللهِ الْحَنِيْفِيَّةُ السَّمْحَةُ

Ḥanīf, as explained earlier, means "inclined towards truth", and *samḥāh* means "easy" or "facile to perform." The implication of this *Ḥadīth* therefore is that: "The religion most beloved of God, the Almighty is that which prescribes instruction regarding pure relationship with Him and its performance is easy."

---

[1] **The performance of relination is prayers the palms of the hands touch the kness.**

Direction for mediation and moderation

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has emphasized the fact that God does not like that the followers of Islam should exceed the bounds of moderation beyond endurance in the observance of obligatory and optional prayers interfering with other affairs of life. Latitude should always be given in the performance of religious obligations according to the environment, ability of an individual and his capability of endurance.

Muslims have before them, the exemplifying principle (*uswah-e-hasanah*) of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). All his life was full of prayer. Even, while asleep with his eyes closed, his mind was awake and offered supplications to the Creator. So on one side we have the exemplifying principle of the Apostle of God and on the other, the exalted nature of his good acts and stimulations. In view of such stimulations, every Muslim feels dedication to devotion, exercise in devotion and strenuous exertions in prayer.

There are many instances of the Prophet's Companions who tried to pray most of the time. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) explained to them that they should only do as much prayer as they could permanently manage lest they should get tired after a couple of days. When the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) started continuous fasting without break, the Companions also began to fast, but the Holy Prophet made them desist from it, saying that they could not stand it. In fact, the power of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) to withstand such ordeals was so high that it was meaningless that others should envy him. Hadrat 'Alqamah narrates that he once asked Hadrat 'Āyishah, 'Ummal-Mu'minīn, what the observance of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was like? Did he resort to any special observances at particular time? She replied : "Not at all. He followed a uniform practice." Later she said, "How can you people ever possess the capacity of the Holy Prophet?"

Excessive devotion to prayers and observance would affect an individual's health, his vocations, and the upbringing of his offspring. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), in order to tone down the excessive zeal for prayers, himself remarked: "Take a via media. The slightest of practice on your part heralds happy tidings." He interdicted severity in observance and assured his followers of the happy tidings of greater *thawab* and proximity to God on normal way of prayer. This emphasis by the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) on a via media is not particular to prayers only but prevails upon the acts of the *ummah* in toto.

The Christians and Jews, before the advent of the Holy Prophet, had no nook and corner left where they would not enforce their own arbitrary decisions. The world was now awaiting the approach of an instructor who would induct it in the ways of moderation and normalcy. Considered from this point of view, how many interesting points of mythical signification would the expression, ‘احب الدين الى الله الحنيفية السمحة’ embody.

That is, if anyone tried to challenge ‘لَنْ يُّشَادَّ الدِّيْنَ اَحَدٌ اِلَّا غَلَبَهٗ’ religion for a wrestling he would be thrown down flat to the ground. *Mushadah* means to do hardship in order to dominate the opponent. If a person believes he can master religion by adopting rigid attitude in its observance with no flexibility, it would be impossible for him to pull on permanently with such a practice. A person who hopes that he would accumulate prayers and ordeals (e.g., fasting) to his account, might do so up to a certain period of time, but in the long run, he has to abandon such practice being impracticable for a longer period. Then he has to yield to religion. It throws light on the person that if he desires to put all his determinations to execution with strict rigidness he cannot manage. He should try to do as much as he can regularly do it. This is better and pleasant.

Obligatory and optional observance

There are two kinds of observance in Islam. Observance allowing no excuse is called obligatory while observance allowing flexibility is called optional. Both are associated with religion, and this being so, our subservience to God demands that both kinds be observed. Both are meant for different occasions. As seeking flexibility every time is irreligious, a desire for rigid observance too is exceeding the limit. Inclination towards too much of flexibility would generate so much of irreligious tendency that the real importance of religion would be lost. It will no longer remain a religion but it would be a collection of desires. If only rigidness is kept in sight every time, it would be a clash with religion, and it is the latter that would emerge triumphant.

Our conclusion, therefore, would be that we should not be on the lookout for excuses or rigidness in observance every time. Both the attitudes are wrong. One points to frustration, the other to failure. Devotion demands both. We should observe option where it is due and rigidness when it is warranted. Ibn 'Umar was well known for his rigid observance and Ibn 'Abbās for his optional observance. Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd 'Abbāsī while requesting Imām Mālik to write his '*Muwatta*' asked him to abstain from the option of Ibn 'Abbās and the rigidness of Ibn 'Umar.

فَسَدِّدُوْا

That is, take to the median path. "سداد" means "to adopt a median way" and stands for moderation.

"واشربوا"

That is, try to be close. If it is difficult to attain perfection, be on the path to perfection. It is not possible for man to decide correctly on every issue nor to remain on the straignt path. This is why the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has shown the alternative position; if an individual does not possess the capacity to act in accordance with what is more perfect, he should at least try to attain what the next is. An individual's first effort should be towards moderation, since it is impossible to be firm at all times. This is implied by "قاربو" after "سددو" that is, walk in the higher direction step by step.

سَدِّدُوْا وَقَارِبُوْا

That is, obtain cheerful tidings—that is to say, even the minor acts of an individual is a harbinger of good tidings. Imām Ghazālī says that the constant dripping of water on a stone for a long duration ultimately bores a hole into it. If the same amount of water is dropped at a time, it would have no effect on the stone. Similarly, constant recitation penetrates into the mind and the heart. Shāh Walī ullāh in the *Ḥujjatullahil Bālighah* writes that the *Sharī'ah* has prescribed small prayer so that it may be for an increased frequency; that is to say, if the amount of prayer is small, it would go to make a large aggregate, whereas if the amount of prayer is already excessive, the aggregate, would be small. A shopkeeper who derives less profit earns more in the long run than the shopkeeper who extracts excessive profits and has to ultimately reduce his profit.

The same analogy applies to prayers. An individual should perform as many acts of prayer as he can. Furthermore, these happy tidings are not dependent on one's firmness and assiduity. One who has managed to keep close to the more perfect path, is deserving of happy tidings.

اَلشَّيْءُ إِذَا قَارَبَ الشَّيْءَ يَأْخُذُ حُكْمَهُ ۔

As each thing is affected by another one closer to it.

ابشرو here connotes both the rightly directed acts and acts that are proximate or parallel to them.

Happy tidings or basharat

There are certain acts for which happy tidings have been specially described and where the limits and the specifications of the requitals have been circumscribed, e.g., the requital to the extent of seven to seven hundred times against a noble act, so much so that we have in the Qur'ān:

وَاللّٰهُ يُضٰعِفُ لِمَنْ يَّشَآءُ ؕ وَاللّٰهُ وَاسِعٌ عَلِيْمٌ ۝ (بقرہ آیت ۲۶۱)

Allah giveth increase manifold to whom He will. (Qur'ān 2:261)

This means that any minor charity in the way of God is considerable for reward, just as out of one grain come seven hundred grains. And it is for Allāh to vouchsafe increment if He so wishes. He would make it seven thousand from seven hundred and even more. He is Compassionate and Beneficent and knows what in the mind of the spender is and the amount he has spent, the source of the wealth, and the intention behind such an act. He thus decides accordingly:

لِيُوَفِّيَهُمْ اُجُوْرَهُمْ وَيَزِيْدَهُمْ مِّنْ فَضْلِهٖ ؕ
اِنَّهٗ غَفُوْرٌ شَكُوْرٌ ۝ (فاطر، آیت ۳۰)

That He will pay them their wages and increase them of His grace. Lo! He is Forgiving, Responsive. (Qur'ān 35:30)

The implication would be that He even likes the slightest of gestures of obedience and through His Beneficence confers far greater rewards than the act that would normally warrant. The other kind of good news is that for which no circumscription and specification of reward and requital exist and God awards some people in a wonderful manner.

فَلَا تَعْلَمُ نَفْسٌ مَّآ اُخْفِيَ لَهُمْ مِّنْ قُرَّةِ
اَعْيُنٍ ۚ جَزَآءًۢ بِمَا كَانُوْا يَعْمَلُوْنَ ۝ (سجدہ آیت ۱۷)

No soul knoweth what is kept hid for them for joy, as a reward for what they used to do. (Qur'ān 32:17)

No one knows the nature of the rewards that He hid for those who worshipped in utter secrecy during the dark nights. They worshipped without the slightest of hypocrisy or venality. Only when the rewards are seen, the eyes would be comforted. In a *ḥadīth* it has been said God has kept in reserve for his noble servants objects that have never been seen by the eye, never been heard, nor thought of. Some exegetes have taken this *ḥadīth* to mean that the rewards in Heaven shall not be corporal. I have written an article *Hdyah Sunniyah* (Gift for Sunniyah) which could be referred to, with advantage for an answer to this view.

وَاسْتَعِيْنُوْا بِالْغَدْوَةِ وَالرَّوْحَةِ وَشَيْءٍ مِّنَ الدُّلْجَةِ That is, from morning till evening and from the departing night obtain succour on the discharge of your obedience, prayers, and other works. A man firmly following these words, can become a favourite of God. It has been summarised that these three timings are quite sufficient for prayers, and those whose zeal for prayers is such that any reduction in their prayers causes them anxiety, are very few. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah who is a Tābeī[1] stated that for forty years he offered the dawn prayers with the ablution performed for the *isha* (night) prayers, finished the Qur'ān 40,000 times, and performed numerous pilgrimages. Such individuals feel distressed at the reduction of their prayers. Faḍil bin Ayāḍ or Sufyān Thūrī said if any monarch knows about the pleasure a worshipper derives, he would invade them forthwith.

This, however, is peculiar to a selected few. Here we are concerned with the common people who cannot withstand such devotion. Such are exceptional people whose excessive prayers do not warrant any reduction in prayers. Mawlāna Gangohī used to say that after 30 years' experience, he found that what he thought to be difficult was indeed very easy to attain and recited the Ḥadīth: 'بالغدوة والروحة و شيء من الدلجة' saying that any one could experiment it and then see what happens.

Times of gladness

Mind is the king which sways over the bodily organs. If it remains strong, all the organs function properly, and, if it weakens or slackens, they also correspondingly become enervated. Every organ derives its instructions from the brain. Now the mind itself derives solace and comfort from prayers. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in this *Ḥadīth* has alluded to the timings of prayers and has fixed the timings of solace to the mind at different periods: these are the occasions of tranquillity or gladness throughout day and night. The first is of morning, the best period of pleasure and the most important as well, when a man, by night completes rest, gets himself relaxed of whole day's exhaustion and man is again fresh. The second period is afternoon. The Mid-day nap also relieves a man of tiredness. The third period is the end of the night having special significance in pleasure. Thus the timings have been arranged as follows: First period dawn (*fajr*) prayers; second period, afternoon (*zuhr*) and gloaming (*a'sr*) prayers, and third period, sunset (*maghrib*) and night (*'isha*) prayers. The Holy Prophet has enjoined the observance of these prayers for success in the objective of the worshippers. He himself adopted this mode whenever he was overcome by the burden of anxiety. The *Ḥadīth* has:

He offered prayers whenever seized by anxiety.

كَانَ إِذَا حَزَنَهٗ أَمْرٌ بَادَرَ إِلَى الصَّلٰوةِ۔

Periodical aid

The periods of the morn and the eve and late night are the periods of joy, concentration, and, therefore, of beatitude. Prayers offered during this period leads to placidity and tranquillity. The Qur'ān has praised people who remember God at such times:

Restrain thyself along with those who cry unto their Lord at morn and evening, seeking His countenance;
(Qur'ān 18:28)

وَاصْبِرْ نَفْسَكَ مَعَ الَّذِيْنَ يَدْعُوْنَ رَبَّهُمْ
بِالْغَدَاةِ وَالْعَشِيِّ يُرِيْدُوْنَ وَجْهَهٗ۔ (كہف آيت ۲۸)

And the last part of the night is the period of grace—a period in which the praise of God, repentance, and supplications gain His Acceptance. This point has been dealt with, in the *Ḥadīth*. Seeking of aid by means of acts also stands proven by the Qur'ān...

---

[1] In the Tabiyad al Ṣaḥifah fi Munāqib Abi Hanifah by al Suyūṭī the *tabiyyāt* of Imām Abū Ḥanifah has been acknowledged. Ibn Ḥajar Makkī and Abū Ḥajar 'Asqalâni also agree with him. It is claimed that he was Haḍrat Anas and other Companions, but no proof exists whether he heard them. Buhiqi has written a treatise proving that the Imâm was a *tabe'ī*.

Seek help in patience and prayer.
(Qur'ān 2:45)

وَاسْتَعِيْنُوْا بِالصَّبْرِ وَالصَّلٰوةِ - (بقرہ، آیت ۴۵)

Prayers offered during these periods would become filled with the search for succour both with respect to time and observance with blessedness.

The meaning of *isti anat* (help)

The implication of *isti 'anat* is that, during these periods, God especially vouchsafes His Grace. Individuals who find it hard to cope with religious obligations have been indicated the periods of Grace. In other words, we are told that if we make arrangements regarding obedience and prayers during these periods, the other timings of prayers and supplications and other religious matters would be facilitated correspondingly.

CHAPTER XXX
PRAYERS ARE A PART OF THE FAITH

بَابُ ٣٠ الصَّلٰوةُ مِنَ الْإِيْمَانِ
وَقَوْلُ اللّٰهِ تَعَالٰى وَمَا كَانَ اللّٰهُ لِيُضِيْعَ إِيْمَانَكُمْ
يَعْنِيْ صَلٰوتَكُمْ عِنْدَ الْبَيْتِ
39 . حَدَّثَنَا عَمْرُو بْنُ خَالِدٍ قَالَ نَا زُهَيْرٌ قَالَ
اَنَا اَبُوْ اِسْحٰقَ عَنِ الْبَرَاءِ اَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ كَانَ اَوَّلَ مَا قَدِمَ الْمَدِيْنَةَ نَزَلَ عَلٰى
اَجْدَادِهٖ اَوْ قَالَ اَخْوَالِهٖ مِنَ الْاَنْصَارِ وَاَنَّهٗ صَلّٰى قِبَلَ
بَيْتِ الْمَقْدِسِ سِتَّةَ عَشَرَ اَوْ سَبْعَةَ عَشَرَ شَهْرًا
وَكَانَ يُعْجِبُهٗ اَنْ تَكُوْنَ قِبْلَتُهٗ قِبَلَ الْبَيْتِ وَاَنَّهٗ صَلّٰى
اَوَّلَ صَلٰوةٍ صَلَّاهَا صَلٰوةَ الْعَصْرِ وَصَلّٰى مَعَهٗ قَوْمٌ
فَخَرَجَ رَجُلٌ مِّمَّنْ صَلّٰى مَعَهٗ فَمَرَّ عَلٰى اَهْلِ مَسْجِدٍ وَّهُمْ
رَاكِعُوْنَ فَقَالَ اَشْهَدُ بِاللّٰهِ لَقَدْ صَلَّيْتُ مَعَ رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ
صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قِبَلَ مَكَّةَ فَدَارُوْا كَمَا هُمْ قِبَلَ
الْبَيْتِ وَكَانَتِ الْيَهُوْدُ قَدْ اَعْجَبَهُمْ اِذْ كَانَ
يُصَلِّيْ قِبَلَ بَيْتِ الْمَقْدِسِ وَاَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ فَلَمَّا
وَلّٰى وَجْهَهٗ قِبَلَ الْبَيْتِ اَنْكَرُوْا ذٰلِكَ قَالَ زُهَيْرٌ
حَدَّثَنَا اَبُوْ اِسْحٰقَ عَنِ الْبَرَاءِ فِيْ حَدِيْثِهٖ هٰذَا
اَنَّهٗ مَاتَ عَلَى الْقِبْلَةِ قَبْلَ اَنْ تُحَوَّلَ رِجَالٌ وَّ
قُتِلُوْا فَلَمْ نَدْرِ مَا نَقُوْلُ فِيْهِمْ فَاَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ تَعَالٰى
وَمَا كَانَ اللّٰهُ لِيُضِيْعَ اِيْمَانَكُمْ ۞

And Allāh has said: "But it was not Allāh's purpose that your faith should be in vain, "that is, the faith as expressed in the prayers offered in the direction of the *Bayt* (*al-Maqdis*).

39. It was narrated to us by 'Amr bin Khālid who heard it from Zuhayr. The latter had it from Abū Ishaq who heard it from:

✶ Al-Barā (bin Azib Abū 'Umara): When the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) came to Madīnah, he first so journed with grand fathers or maternal uncles from the Anṣār. He (while at Madinah) offered his prayers in the direction of the Bayt al-Maqdis, for sixteen and seven months, but he rather preferred he should offer them facing the *Ka'bah* (at Makkah). The first prayer which he offered facing the *Ka'bah* was that of *a'ṣr*, together with a few who had joined. Later, one of the Companions who had prayed with him passed by a mosque where the worshippers were in *ruku'* with their faces towards the Bayt al-Maqdis. He said to them, "By Allāh, I assert I have prayed with the Apostle (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) of God with my face in the direction of *Ka'bah*." When the worshippers heard this, they immediately turned their faces (while in prayer) towards the *Ka'bah*. The Jews and the other people of the Scriptures (i e., Christians) who up to this time were rather pleased to see the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) offer his prayers in the direction of Jerusalam, became displeased (with this change).

Al-Zuhayr narrated he had it from Abū Isḥāq who had it from al-Barrā (who adds): "Some persons (i.e., Muslims) had expired before this change in direction. (They had offered prayers in the direction of the first *qiblāh;* some of them had died the death of martyrs. We do not know what to say about them whether they reaped the reward of prayers or not)." Finally, God made this *ayah* descend: But it was not Allāh's purpose that your faith should be in vain.

The connexion

Imām Bukhārī, in the preceding chapter, has described the religion of ease. Here he is proving it as an example. The prayer, despite being the basis of the progress of faith and Islam, is easy and simple. It occupies hardly an hour and a quarter during the full day of twenty-four hours. It involves no physical hardship, and different alternations on the easier side have been provided for those who are sick or on journey. Prayers, therefore, are the examples of such important aspect of supplication to God and serve as the demarcation between faith and infidelity. The Holy Prophet's words about prayers are: 'الصلوة عمادالدين' "Prayers are the pillars of faith". Murji'ahs claim that prayers have no connexion with faith. This viewpoint has been refuted here. Observances and acts have so deep and inextricable connexion with the faith that in the Qur'ān prayers have been equated with faith. Prayers being the most important mode and the strongest pillar of faith, the special relationship between them and faith, has been designated as the principal faith. Bukhārī regards prayers, as the instances of the other obligations, as a part of faith. He is arguing from 'وما كان الله ليضيع ايمانكم' "But it was not Allāh's purpose that your faith should be in vain." This argument of Bukhārī can only be justified if faith can be applied to the word, *ṣalāt*, on the basis of the proposition that the whole and the part are absolutely conjointed. Bukhārī's argument would lose its force if this is not so. If the prayers spread over sixteen or seventeen months are regarded as wasted, the faith itself would be a waste. Faith, with the fall of the main pillar, cannot remain without being affected. This chapter is by way of explication; the absolute and universal link of the part and the whole requires to be established.

The meaning of the Qur'anic verse in the Present Chapter

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), after his exodus from Makkah and arrival in Madīnah, offered prayers for some sixteen to seventeen months in the direction of Bayt al-Maqdis. Change in direction was then ordained. Those well versed in the affairs of the divine mystery and secrets and who, by virtue of their perception knew very well the distinction between the *Ka'bah* and the Bayt al-Maqdis, knew that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) epitomized all the qualities and attributes of the earlier Prophets to a degree of perfection and that his message was meant for all mankind. It was therefore essential that the Bayt al-Maqdis should also be bid welcome. This is why he had the occasion to meet all the earlier Prophets and the Bayt al-Maqdis served the purpose of the place of worship. The *Aḥādīth* of the Ascension have stated clearly that all the Prophets offered their prayers after the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). But those whose acumen was not so deep, thought that, when the Bayt al-Maqdis was not the real *qiblah*, what would happen to those that had died in the meantime or to the prayers of those who were alive and who prayed in that direction? It is towards the dubiety of this problem that this *āyah* is addressed:

But it was not Allāh's purpose that your faith should be in vain, for Allāh is full of pity, Merciful towards mankind. (Qur'ān 2:143)	وَمَا كَانَ اللّٰهُ لِيُضِيْعَ اِيْمَانَكُمْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ بِالنَّاسِ لَرَءُوْفٌ رَّحِيْمٌ (بقره، آيت ۱۴۳)

When you have offered prayers in the direction of Bayt al-Maqdis, propelled as you were by the force of faith and submission to God, nothing will be detracted from your requital. An act performed in the path of faith enjoys a very high rank before God who is "full of pity, Merciful towards Mankind."

The consensus of the scholars is that both the *Ka'bah* and Jerusalem are *qiblahs* from the olden times, and the division of the two is based upon the division into two territories. The Holy Prophet, (صلى الله عليه وسلم) as long as he was in Makkah, offered prayers in the direction of Makkah, since the people of that city were descended from Prophet Ismā'īl ; they had the *Ka'bah* as their *qiblah*. The people of Madīnah were the People of the Scriptures with the Bayt al-Maqdis as their *qiblah*, and therefore at Madīnah, the Bayt al-Maqdis was fixed as the *qiblah*. Both these holy places happen to be the sacrificial places of two pre-eminent Prophets. Prophet Ismā'īl was offered for sacrifice at Makkah and the people of 'Arabia who were the descendants of that Prophet were given the *Ka'bah* as their *qiblah*. Prophet Isḥāq was offered for sacrifice at Jerusalem[1] and therefore the latter was made the *qiblah* for the Isralites. (If we accept the *Ka'bah* as *qiblah* on the basis of two great divisions of a religion deriving from Prophet Ibrāhīm), we are neither faced by the problem of annulment nor of theological content. The implication of the *āyāt* 'ما كان الله ليضيع ايمانكم' means "But it was not Allāh's purpose that your prayers should be in vain". The prayers offered during the first 16-17 months at Madīnah in the direction of the Bayt al-Maqdis should not be thought to have been in vain, and, since before *Hijrah* the *Ka'bah* was the *qiblah*, there is, consequently, no question of the prayers offered at Makkah having gone vain. The question now remains regarding the prayers offered in the direction of the Bayt al-Maqdis at Madīnah. The *āyah* was made to descend for resolving the doubt concerning prayers offered in the direction of the Bayt al-Maqdis with all sincerity and dedication. Allāh shall not allow them to have been in vain.

The Holy Prophet كان أول ما قدم المدينة نزل على أجداده أو قال أخواله (صلى الله عليه وسلم), arriving at Madīnah, stayed with his relations or maternal uncles among the *Anṣārs*. Hadrat Al-Barrā' has employed the words, *akhwāl* or *ajdād*. If the word is *ajdād* (ancestors), the implication would be the same, since the sum total of ancestry, paternal or maternal, is the same. It should be recalled that the Holy Prophet's mother, Hadrat Āminah, belonged to the tribe of *Banī al-Najār* and his great-grandfather, Hāshim, carried on trading with Syria. He used to sojourn at Madīnah which was in the way. There happened to be a woman by the name of Salmā in that city. She was very beautiful, to whom Hāshim made an offer of marriage. She accepted, subject to her right of *tatlīq* (right of separation) remaining with her. Hāshim accepted and the marriage was solemnised. 'Abd al-Muttalib, the Holy Prophet's grandfather, was born from that marriage. *Banī Najār* were the ancestors of the Prophet, and from this point of view they can be called *akhwāl*. Barrā' ibn 'Āzib has used the words, *ajdād* and *akhwāl* in a metaphorical sense. When the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) arrived at Madīnah, the different chiefs of Madīnah called upon him, invited him to their respective homes, and offered all support. Members of Banī Najār also called, especially, those related to him through Hāshim. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said his she-camel has been ordained by God to determine where he would put up. This he repeated even after the insistence of his maternal relatives. The she-camel was unleased; she roved awhile, returned, and sat at a place, walked a little, and then returned to the same place. She reclined her neck and rested there as if she had no life left. This house belonged to Ḥaḍrat Abū Ayyūb Anṣarī who was related to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) from his grandfather's paternal side. This is how the words, *'alā ajdādihī* or *akhwālihī* have been used.

---

[1] **That is, however, not the Muslim view.**

"And for 16-17 months أَنَّهُ صَلَّى قِبَلَ بَيْتِ الْمَقْدِسِ سِتَّةَ عَشَرَ شَهْرًا أَوْ سَبْعَةَ عَشَرَ شَهْرًا he prayed in the direction of the **Bayt al-Maqdis.**"

There are different statements regarding the duration for which the Bayt al-Maqdis served as the *qiblah*. Imām Tirmidhī has given the period as 16 months. Imām Nawawī has accorded credence to this period in his exegesis of the *Muslim*. In the *Sharḥ Bukhārī* it has been stated that, although there is room for doubt, Imām Muslim and others have reproduced the period of 16 months from the authority of Ḥaḍrat Barrā' ibn 'Āzib and this should be relied upon. Imām Bazār and Ṭābrānī have fixed the duration as 17 months. The *muḥaddith*, Ibn Ḥabbān, has given the period as seventeen months and three days, and from Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās's narrative, the date of the entry of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) within the precincts of Madīnah is 12 Rabī' al-Awwal. It is also agreed that the recession of the earlier *qiblah* and the substitution of the new one in its place was ordained the next year in the month of *Rajab* (15th) and the command descended: "So turn thy face toward the Inviolable Place of Worship". (Qur'ān, 2:144)

From the 12th *Rabī' al-Awwal* to the 15th Rajab it comes to sixteen months and three days and if the month of *Hijrah* and the recession of the earlier *qiblah* are enumerated separately, the period comes to 17 months. Counted together, they both add up to 16 months. This is how the different statements are reconciled.

The natural predilection of the Holy Prophet towards the Ka'bah

The natural inclination of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) towards the real *qiblah*, that is, facing the *Masjid al-Ḥarām*, is desired for several reasons. The House of God is pre-eminent as a centre. Some Traditions have that the *Baytullāh* is situated on the navel of the earth, that is, the point where earth was strewn on water and it ultimately protruded from this point. The *Baytullāh* is situated at a central point of the earth. Each thing gravitates towards its centre as a matter of principle, and therefore the predilection of the Holy Prophet towards the *Baytullāh* was natural. The first sacred place dedicated to the worship of God and made into a place of worship and as symbol of Guidance is the self-same *Ka'batullāh*. All the sacred shrines postdated it. The Qur'ān therefore says:

> Lo! the first Sanctuary appointed for mankind was that at Makkah, a blessed place, a guidance to the peoples.
> (Qur'ān, 3:96)

> إِنَّ أَوَّلَ بَيْتٍ وُّضِعَ لِلنَّاسِ لَلَّذِي بِبَكَّةَ
> مُبَارَكًا وَّهُدًى لِّلْعٰلَمِينَ (آلِ عمران، آیت ۹۶)

God has blessed this Sanctuary, this Inviolable Shrine, with Grace—apparent and inner, pulpable and symbolic and appointed it as the mainspring of guidance for the whole world. Every place of worship in the world is a reflection of this House. Mankind was invited to circumambulate round this House and those who do so are blessed with all sorts of illumination and blessings. The earlier Prophets also gathered like moths (lovers) round this candle, calling *talbiyah* ("what is your command? Here I am"). People of all ages held it in deep reverence; and privileged were those that entered into precincts. The steps of Prophet Ibrāhīm attest to the fact of that Prophet having come here. The history of the House which has passed to us with a remarkable degree of unanimity shows that this is the stone on which the Prophet stood to supervise the construction of the *Ka'bah*, and it was by the Grace of God that the stone had the imprint of the Prophet's step, which is preserved to this day. Thus, besides the historical narratives, the presence of this sacred stone is an irrefutable proof of the fact that, after the devastation of Floods during the time of Noah, Prophet Abraham had this Inviolable Shrine built with his pure hands. His grandeur demands that a *qiblah* should be one that embodies such attributes.

Coming now to the central import of the House of God, it is but natural that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and this Inviolable Shrine should have had rapport with each other. If the House of God has precedence over all other shrines, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has a central place among the Prophets. The *Baytullāh* is the raison d'etre for the stability of the world; the existence of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) promises permanence to the world, indeed, the cosmos. The Qur'ān emphasises the stability and the firmness of the world thus:

> Allāh hath appointed the Ka'bah, the Sacred House, a standard for mankind...
> (Qur'ān, 5:97)
>
> جَعَلَ اللّٰهُ الْكَعْبَةَ الْبَيْتَ الْحَرَامَ قِيٰمًا
> لِّلنَّاسِ (مائدہ، آیت ۹۷)

The relationship of the *Baytullāh* with the national and political life of Muslims is like that of an active soul in a body. Detach it from that centripetal force and it would bet orn apart. The centrifugal forces so released would lead them to disgrace from grace and to destruction in place of consolidation. On this analogy for the material world at large, *al-Ka'bah al-Bayt al-Ḥarām* constitutes grace and firmness. The teeming millions of the world will be there in the world as long as there are some that would revere this House of God. When God, the Almighty finally decides to do away with this world of ours, He shall lift this Inviolable Shrine that we designate as the *Ka'bah*. This would be so, because this was the first place of worship.

There is a *Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, according to which, a black negro (who has been designated as *dhū al-Sawīqatayn*) shall dig out each and every stone of the *Ka'bah*. As long as God wishes to keep organisation of the world intact, no power on earth, whosoever puissant, shall succeed in its wicked design.

Owners of the Elephants

The story of the owners of the Elephants is well-known. Several communities of early times tried their utmost to destroy the Ka'bah and others are even now trying to do so. But it is due to special favours of Allāh and truthfulness of the religion of Islam that the enemies of Islam miserably failed in their satanic attempts. If the Divine Being does not desire to protect the Ka'bah against the evil designs of the opponents of Islam, it will mean the destruction of the entire universe.

It is our experience that a large number of people are killed for the purpose of saving royal palaces and capitals of states, but if any change is to be made in government buildings for improvement or some expediency, it can be done easily without bloodshed. Perhaps Imām Bukhārī has inserted the *Ḥadīth* of "ذوالسو یقتین" (a title of a black negro) in the chapter of "جعل الله الکعبة البیت الحرام قیاماً للناس" "i.e. Allāh hath appointed the Ka'bah, the Sacred House, a standard for mankind." (Qur'ān, 5:97) with this purpose in view.

The Holy Qur'ān bears witness that the community of Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad is basically the community of Prophet Abraham (Ibrāhīm) (علیه السلام), as under :

Say: Lo! As for me, my Lord hath guided me unto a straight path, a right religion, the community of Abraham, the upright. (Qur'ān, 6:162)

قُلْ إِنَّنِي هَدٰىنِي رَبِّي إِلٰى صِرَاطٍ مُّسْتَقِيمٍ ۚ
دِيْنًا قِيَمًا مِّلَّةَ إِبْرٰهِيمَ حَنِيفًا ۚ (انعام، آیت ۱۶۲)

In this verse Allāh stresses the point that Islam is a religion of pure monotheism and unconditional surrender to Allāh and the Islam is basically the religion of Prophet Abraham (Ibrāhīm علیه السلام). "صراط مستقیم" "straight path", "دین قیم" "right religion" and "ملة ابراهیم" "community of Abraham" express the same idea. As the Ka'bah was the Qiblah of Ḥaḍrat Ibrāhīm (علیه السلام), naturally it was also the Qiblah of Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلی الله علیه وسلم).

Why was Jerusalem the first Qiblah of Islam?

Turning face to Qiblah in prayer resembles the event of *Mi'rāj* (the Prophet's Ascension to Heaven). As the Messenger of Allāh was first taken to Jerusalem (Bayt al-Maqdis) in course of his ascension to Heaven, so also he was first ordered by Allāh to turn his face to Jerusalem in prayer and afterwards to the Ka'bah, which is the ultimate destination of our spiritual struggles. Allāh made the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) a combination of all merits from eternity, but those merits had to pass through various stages of development in the world until he became a personification of perfection in all respects. Prophethood is not an acquired matter as it is a Divine Gift. But it was conferred on Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلی الله علیه وسلم) after a series of meditation and devotion. During *Mi'rāj* (Ascension), the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) was not carried to Heavens direct. He had to go first to Jerusalem which was a centre of Divine manifestations and a Qiblah of all Apostles of the Israelites. In this sacred place, all Prophets assembled and offered prayers under the Imāmat (guidance) of the Holy Apostle of Islam (صلی الله علیه وسلم). He was then raised to the position of Head of Prophets.

Ḥaḍrat Ibrāhīm (Abraham) had two sons, viz. Ḥaḍrat Ismā'īl (Ishmael) and Ḥaḍrat Isḥāq (Isaac) (may peace be on all of them). The descendants of Ḥaḍrat Ismā'īl were custodian of the Ka'bah and those of Ḥaḍrat Isḥāq were of Jerusalem. Before the advent of Islam, the Prophets of Syria or 'Arabia were custodian of either of the two. As Allāh endowed the Final Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسم) with all those qualities which He had given to various Prophets separately, He made him custodian of both the Qiblahs (i.e., Ka'bah and Jerusalem). Thus he became Prophet of two Qiblahs. When all Apostles accepted the leadership of Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلی الله علیه وسلم), their followers have no rhyme and reason to object. When the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) returned from *Mi'rāj*, he came back direct to the Ka'bah (and not via

Jerusalem). This points to the fact that Jerusalem is an intermediate station while the Ka'bah is the ultimate destination and this was the Qiblah of Prophet Abraham also. During the period when the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) turned his face to Jerusalem, he was anxious to get his Qiblah changed to the Ka'bah, as the Qur'ān says:

> **We have seen the turning of the face to heaven (for guidance, O Muḥammad). And now verily We shall make thee turn (in prayer) toward a Qiblah which is dear to thee. So turn thy face toward the Inviolable Place of Worship. (Qur'ān, 2:144)**

قَدْ نَرٰى تَقَلُّبَ وَجْهِكَ فِى السَّمَآءِ ۚ
فَلَنُوَلِّيَنَّكَ قِبْلَةً تَرْضٰهَا ص فَوَلِّ وَجْهَكَ
شَطْرَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ ۭ (بقرہ، آیت ۱۴۴)

Commandment or personal judgment

The question is whether the Prophet's choice of Jerusalem as Qiblah was his personal judgment or commandment of Allāh. A few scholars say that it was his personal opinion but an overwhelming majority of them hold that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) only implemented the instruction of Allāh. Had the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) chosen Jerusalem as Qiblah without the Divine Inspiration, he could have easily changed it to the Ka'bah because he was exceedingly anxious to do so (as the above-quoted verses of the Qur'ān clearly indicate). As the first Qiblah (Jerusalem) was chosen according to the Divine Inspiration, another Inspiration was needed to change it to Ka'bah. The Qur'ān says:

> **And We appointed the Qiblah which Ye formerly observed only that We might know him who followeth the Messenger. (Qur'ān, 2:143)**

وَمَا جَعَلْنَا الْقِبْلَةَ الَّتِىْ كُنْتَ عَلَيْهَآ اِلَّا
لِنَعْلَمَ مَنْ يَّتَّبِعُ الرَّسُوْلَ - (بقرہ، آیت ۱۴۳)

In this verse, the nominative of the verb "جعلنا" is Allāh Himself. Further, Ibn 'Abbās narrates a *Ḥadīth* which says:

> **Allāh commanded him (Holy Prophet *ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) to turn towards Jerusalem in prayer (vide *Fatḥ al-Mulhim*) Vol. II. page 119).**

اَمَرَهُ اللّٰهُ اَنْ يَّسْتَقْبِلَ بَيْتَ الْمَقْدِسِ
(الحدیث فی فتح الملہم ص ۱۱۹/۲)

The first prayer which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) offered turning towards the Ka'bah was that of '*Aṣr* (afternoon prayer). There is difference of opinion regarding the mosques where and the time when Qiblah was changed. Some scholars say that it was the time of '*Aṣr* and other say that it was the time of *Ẓuhr*. The Ṭabaqāt of Ibn Sa'd prefers the latter's view. This *Ḥādīth* shows that it was the Prophet's mosque where, and it was the time of '*Aṣr*, when the Qiblah was changed. Ḥafiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that the change of Qiblah took place at *Ẓuhr* prayer.

The Messenger of Allāh went to the house[1] of Bishr bin al-Barā' bin Ma'rūr (this place was three miles off from the Prophet's mosque) and offered *Ẓuhr* prayer there. When he completed the first two Rak'āt and knelt for the third Rak'at, Revelations came to him changing the Qiblah from Jerusalem to the Ka'bah and he completed the remaining parts of the *Ẓuhr* prayer, turning his face towards the Ka'bah. This mosque which was ever called Masjidi Banī Salmah is now known as Masjid-i-Qiblatayn (mosque of two Qiblās).

---

[1] Al-Barā' bin Ma'rur who had special interest on the Ka'bah Revelation regarding change of Qiblah came when the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) offered his prayers in the mosque of his locality. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has discussed this subject minutely. The reader may refer to *Faḍl al-Bārī* pages 473-475 for details. *Ed.*

All of them turned towards the Ka'bah in the فداروا كما هم قبل البيت same condition. Now there is some objection, viz. turning from one direction to another involves some work or movement which spoils prayers. This objection is met in several ways viz. (i) Change of Qiblah was ordered before such movement or acts were banned by Islam (as talking during prayers was not disallowed in the beginning; (ii) This extra work was excused at that time for the sake of expediency; (iii) and the movement or work on the occasion was not a continuous affair. (For details see *Fatḥ al Mulhim, Sharḥi Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* Vol. II, page 120).

Though this *Ḥadīth* is Khabari Wāḥid (i.e. this *Ḥadīth* had come down to us through one transmitter), there are strong evidences In support of it. Therefore, it has abrogated the previous orders. If any order is cancelled by another order, the previous order will remain in force until the superseding order is known to the people concerned. Hence, the people of the mosques of Banī Ḥārithah and Qubā did not offer (i.e. repeat) their prayer after change of Qiblah.

وَكَانَتِ الْيَهُودُ قَدْ أَعْجَبَهُمْ إِذْ كَانَ يُصَلِّي قِبَلَ بَيْتِ الْمَقْدِسِ وَأَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ

When the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) prayed, turning towards Jerusalem, the Jews and other people of the Book were very much pleased and approved his action. The phrase "واهل الكتاب" (peoples of the Book) is connected with the "*al-Yahūd*" (the Jews). Now the question is "Who were intended by the people of the Book here? If they were the Jews, it is mere repetition without justification, and if they were the Christians, they had no cause of pleasure as their Qiblah was Baytul Laḥm" which was the birth place of Jesus Christ (may peace be on him) and which was situated on the East of Jerusalem, as the following verse of the Qur'ān indicates.

When she (Mary) had withdrawn from her people to a chamber looking East. (Qur'ān, 19:16)

إِذِ انْتَبَذَتْ مِنْ أَهْلِهَا مَكَانًا شَرْقِيًّا (مريم، آيت ١٦)

It is said that the people of the book here mean Christians who liked the first Qiblah of the Muslims on two grounds viz. (i) Baytul Laḥm and Jerusalem were on the same direction from Madīnah and (ii) the Christians were bound to follow the commandments and prohibitions of the Old Testament in the same way as the Jesus. The Testament is a book of stories and admonitions and does not deal with legislative and other necessary matters.

Muslim scholars differ as to Jerusalem was the Qiblah of Ḥaḍrat Mūsā (Prophet Moses, may peace be on him) or not. Some of them say that the Qiblah of all Apostles was Ka'bah, and others say that Jerusalem was the Qiblah of Prophet Moses. Shāh Walī ullāh and Ibnul Qayyim are of the opinion that the Israelites' Qiblah was Jerusalem and the Ismailites' Ka'bah. Some people say that the Israelites had no fixed Qiblah. They turned towards *Tābūt* (Arks) in prayer. Afterwards this Ark was placed in Jerusalem and then it (Jerusalem) became their Qiblah though, in fact, it was *Tābūt* towards which the Jesus turned while offering prayers.

There is a question here. Change of Qiblah took place before the first Islamic battle of *Badr*, and before that there was no fighting between Muslims and infidels. How then can the word "قتلوا" "they were killed" be applicable here. The answer is that before the well-known battle of *Badr*, there might have been some clash between Muslims and non-Muslims resulting in the death of some Muslims. Further, it is not necessary to wage war for killing persons. At Makkah before Hijrat (migration), several Muslims were tortured to death, including Sumayyah, mother of 'Ammār bin Yāsir, who had been killed by Abū Jahl.

We do not know what we can say about them. فَلَمْ نَدْرِ مَا نَقُوْلُ فِيْهِمْ If we study *Aḥādīth* and historical facts we come to the conclusion that there were two occasions when the companions were concerned about those Muslims who had died while acting on those orders which had already been abrogated. They referred the matter to the Messenger of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) and the verses of the Qur'ān were revealed to satisfy them. The first of these occasions was in connection with change of Qiblah when Allāh revealed the following verse; "وما كان الله ليضيع ايمانكم" "But it was not Allāh's purpose that your faith should be in vain". (Qur'ān, 2:143) The second occasion was in connection with the unlawfulness of wine. Before the revelation of the Qur'ānic verse, banning wine, several Muslims continued drinking wine and died in that state and some companions after drinking wine joined the Battle of *Uḥud* and were killed (martyred) there. Naturally, the Muslims were concerned about the fate of those companions and said to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), "What will be the fate of our fellow workers who died but they had not stopped drinking". In reply, the following verse was revealed.

There shall be no sin (imputed) unto those who believe and do good works for what they may have eaten (in the past).
(Qur'ān, 5:93)

لَيْسَ عَلَى الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَعَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ
جُنَاحٌ فِيْمَا طَعِمُوْٓا (مائدہ، آیت ۹۳)

Now the question to be considered is: on several occasions some Islamic orders were abrogated or amended and many Muslims died while continuing to act on the abrogated or amended orders (for some reason or the other); but the companions did not express their concern about them. Why were they concerned about these two matters only i.e. change of Qiblah and unlawfulness of wine? A *Ḥadīth* of Musnadi Aḥmad mentions these two things together. This shows that there is some peculiarity about these two. The fact is that before the actual revelation of the Qur'ānic verses about the change of Qiblah and unlawfulness of wine, there were strong evidences that sooner or later they would take place positively. For example: Before the advent of Islam the people were accustomed to drink wine freely and frequently, and it would have been very hard for them to give up drinking all of a sudden. Steps were, therefore, taken gradually to persuade them to abandon this habit. First of all this verse of the Qur'ān was revealed:

They question thee about strong drink and games of chance. Say: In both is great sin, and (some) utility for men; but the sin of them is greater than their usefulness. (Qur'ān, 2:219)

يَسْـَٔلُوْنَكَ عَنِ الْخَمْرِ وَالْمَيْسِرِ قُلْ فِيْهِمَآ
اِثْمٌ كَبِيْرٌ وَّمَنَافِعُ لِلنَّاسِ وَاِثْمُهُمَآ اَكْبَرُ مِنْ
نَّفْعِهِمَا ط (بقرہ، آیت ۲۱۹)

As a result of this verse, the people understood that wine would be banned sooner or later. Ḥaḍrat 'Umar prayed to Allāh and requested Him to issue clear orders regarding wine. Then the following verse of the Qur'ān was revealed:-

Draw not near unto prayer when ye are drunken. (Qur'ān, 4:43)

لَا تَقْرَبُوا الصَّلٰوةَ وَاَنْتُمْ سُكٰرٰى (نساء، آیت ۴۳)

Ḥaḍrat 'Umar prayed to Allāh again. At last the final order was issued, as the Qur'ān says:

> O ye who believe! Strong drink and games of chance and idols and divining arrows are only an infamy of Satān's handiwork. Leave it aside in order that ye may succeed. Satan seeketh only to cast among you enmity and hatred by means of strong drink and games of chance, and to turn you from remembrance of Allāh and from (His) worship. Will ye then have done? (Qur'ān, 5:90:91)

يٰۤاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْۤا اِنَّمَا الْخَمْرُ وَالْمَيْسِرُ
وَالْاَنْصَابُ وَالْاَزْلَامُ رِجْسٌ مِّنْ عَمَلِ الشَّيْطٰنِ
فَاجْتَنِبُوْهُ لَعَلَّكُمْ تُفْلِحُوْنَ ۝ اِنَّمَا يُرِيْدُ الشَّيْطٰنُ
اَنْ يُّوْقِعَ بَيْنَكُمُ الْعَدَاوَةَ وَالْبَغْضَآءَ فِى الْخَمْرِ
وَالْمَيْسِرِ وَيَصُدَّكُمْ عَنْ ذِكْرِ اللّٰهِ وَعَنِ الصَّلٰوةِ
فَهَلْ اَنْتُمْ مُّنْتَهُوْنَ ۝ المائدہ، آیت ۹۱-۹۰

Now Ḥaḍrat 'Umar said: O Lord. "We have stopped it, We have stopped it."

Similarly, the Muslims knew beforehand that Qiblah would be changed from Jerusalem to the Ka'bah because the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) repeatedly prayed to Allāh for it. Allāh's bounty for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was very great. So He accepted his prayer in these words. اِنَّ فَضْلَهٗ كَانَ عَلَيْكَ كَبِيْرًا

"Now We shall make thee turn (in prayer) toward a Qiblah which is dear to thee" (Qur'ān 2:144)

In short, some Muslims continued to act on abrogated or amended order and died in that condition. The Prophet's Companions sympathised with them and referred their case to him for favourable consideration.

"And it was not Allāh's purpose that your *Īmān* (Faith) should be in vain" (Qur'ān, 2:143) وَمَا كَانَ اللّٰهُ لِيُضِيْعَ اِيْمَانَكُمْ

By *Īmān* prayers are meant here. It was the natural demand of *Īmān* that Muslims offered prayers turning their faces towards Jerusalem and some of them died in that condition. Had they lived after the change of Qiblah, they would have certainly followed the new orders and turned towards Ka'bah. If prayers of such Muslims were declared null and void it would amount to nullifying *Īmān* altogether.

Hence Imām Bukhārī's claim that prayers are parts of *Īmān*, on the ground that in the Qur'ānic verse *Īmān* means prayers is not tenable. In the verse, *Īmān* stands for prayers, not because they are parts of *Īmān* but because they are one of the essentials thereof.

When some Companions questioned the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) about the fates of those Muslims who drank wine before its unlawfulness and died in that condition, the following verses of the Qur'ān were revealed.

> There shall be no sin (imputed) unto those who believe and do good works for what they may have eaten (in the past). So be mindful of your duty (to Allāh), and do good works; and again: be mindful of your duty, and believe; and once again: be mindful of your duty, and do right. Allāh loveth the good. (Qur'ān, 5:93)

لَيْسَ عَلَى الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَعَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ
جُنَاحٌ فِيْمَا طَعِمُوْۤا اِذَا مَا اتَّقَوْا وَّاٰمَنُوْا وَعَمِلُوا
الصّٰلِحٰتِ ثُمَّ اتَّقَوْا وَّاٰمَنُوْا ثُمَّ اتَّقَوْا وَّاَحْسَنُوْا ؕ
وَاللّٰهُ يُحِبُّ الْمُحْسِنِيْنَ ۝ (مائدہ، آیت ۹۳)

From this Qur'ānic verse, it may be inferred that there is no harm if one eats things during the time when they were permissible, particularly, when one is virtuous, pious and God-fearing. Those Muslims who sacrificed their lives in the cause of Allāh could not be blamed for the use of these things which had been once permissible. In the *Ḥadīth* of Jibra'īl (Gabriel) *Iḥsān* is explained as "You worship Allāh (offer prayers) as if you see Him." The Companions who were martyred in the way of Allāh, attained the position of *Iḥsān* and hence they were above all sorts of blame.

Learned scholars say that *Taqwā* (to fear Allāh) has various degrees, and *Īmān* also has various degrees as based on remembrance of Allāh, good work and *Jihād* in the cause of Allāh. The more one will be devoted to the Creator, the more one's heart will be fixed with spiritual height and will attain to the zenith of perfection (i.e. *Iḥsān.*)

The above-mentioned questions were put regarding certain Companions and their answers were given in a comprehensive manner so as to include all similar cases. Imām Bukhārī has narrated the aforesaid *Ḥadīth* through 'Amr bin Khālid and Barā' refers to Barā' bin 'Āzib Anṣārī who was a Companion, son of a Companion of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). It is mentioned in the *Ḥadīth* that some Companions died and others were killed in Jerusalem. The Muslims who died after prayers had been made obligatory but before the change of Qiblah are named below:

(i) Three died at Makkah: 'Abdullāh bin Shihāb, Muṭṭalib bin Azhar and Sakrān bin 'Amr 'Āmirī.

(ii) Five died in Ḥabash: Ḥaṭāb bin Ḥārith Aljamḥī, 'Amr bin Umayyah al-Asadī, 'Abdullāh bin Ḥārith al-Sahmī, 'Urwah bin 'Abdul 'Azmī and 'Adī bin Naḍlah al-'Adviyān.

(iii) Two Anṣārs died at Madīnah:— Al-Barā' bin Ma'rūr and As'ad bin Zarārah. During this period Iyās bin Ma'ādh al-Ashhalī died, but it is doutful whether he was Muslim.

In connection with the word "قتلوا" (They were killed), there is one objection viz; there was no battle between Muslims and infidels before the change of Qiblah, hence no person killed during the period was named. The answer is that absence of description does not necessarily mean negation of the event.

CHAPTER XXXI

Excellence of a person who accepts Islam.

Imām Mālik said that he was informed by Zayd bin Aslam that 'Aṭā' bin Yasār had told him that:

✱ Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī heard the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say:

"When any person who embraces Islam, and is sincere in accepting Islam, Allāh will forgive all the sins he committed before Islam, and afterwards new accounts will begin. For each good deed of his, 10-to 700 good deeds will be recorded (i. e. he will be rewarded accordingly), and each bad deed will be recorded as it is, save that Allāh forgives it."

40. We have been told by Isḥāq bin Manṣūr who said that he was informed by 'Abdur Razzāq who said: Ma'mar narrated via Hammām via Abū Hurayrah:

✱ He (last narrator) heard:

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say: "When any one of you makes Islam excellent then for each good deed of his, 10 to 700 good deeds will be recorded and his each bad deed will be recorded as it is".

بَابُ 31 حُسْنُ إِسْلَامِ الْمَرْءِ

قَالَ مَالِكٌ أَخْبَرَنِي زَيْدُ بْنُ أَسْلَمَ أَنَّ
عَطَاءَ بْنَ يَسَارٍ أَخْبَرَهُ أَنَّ أَبَا سَعِيدٍ الْخُدْرِيَّ
أَخْبَرَهُ أَنَّهُ سَمِعَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
يَقُولُ إِذَا أَسْلَمَ الْعَبْدُ فَحَسُنَ إِسْلَامُهُ يُكَفِّرُ
اللَّهُ عَنْهُ كُلَّ سَيِّئَةٍ كَانَ زَلَفَهَا وَكَانَ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ
الْقِصَاصُ الْحَسَنَةُ بِعَشْرِ أَمْثَالِهَا إِلَى سَبْعِ مِائَةِ
ضِعْفٍ وَالسَّيِّئَةُ بِمِثْلِهَا إِلَّا أَنْ يَتَجَاوَزَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا

40- حَدَّثَنَا إِسْحٰقُ بْنُ مَنْصُورٍ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا
عَبْدُ الرَّزَّاقِ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا مَعْمَرٌ عَنْ هَمَّامٍ عَنْ
أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ إِذَا أَحْسَنَ أَحَدُكُمْ إِسْلَامَهُ فَكُلُّ حَسَنَةٍ
يَعْمَلُهَا تُكْتَبُ لَهُ بِعَشْرِ أَمْثَالِهَا إِلَى سَبْعِ مِائَةِ
ضِعْفٍ وَكُلُّ سَيِّئَةٍ يَعْمَلُهَا تُكْتَبُ لَهُ بِمِثْلِهَا

Imām Bukhārī pointed out earlier in the chapter on "الدين يسر" (Religion is something easy) that *Īmān* has comparative ranks and degrees as there are different ranks and degrees in religion. Now he desires to say that, as beauty or excellence has comparative degrees, so also *Īmān* has. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that this *Ḥadīth* of the chapter has two parts. The first part refutes the theory of those people who deny increase and decrease in *Īmān*. Beauty is a quality of Islam, and, as beauty has various degrees, so also Islam has. When it is beneficial to accept Islam, it is harmful to reject it. The second part of the *Ḥadīth* repudiates the views of the Khāwrijites and Mu'tazilites. 'Allāmah Badruddīn 'Aynī says that, in the last chapter, it was stated that Namāz (prayers) is a part of Faith, and now it is said that the beauty of Islam consists in Namāz (i.e., Islam cannot be an excellent or beautiful religion without prayers). 'Allāmah 'Aynī says that beauty is a quality of a thing and that increase and decrease in the quality of a thing do not necessarily prove that the thing itself will have increase and decrease. Beauty occupies the same position in *Īmān* as beauty has in one's face. This *Ḥadīth* rejects the *Murji'ah* sect who deny that work affects *Īmān* and also the Khāwrijites and Mu'tazilites who hold that a Muslim after committing major sins, ceases to be Muslim.

Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī heard the Holy Prophet إِذَا أَسْلَمَ الْعَبْدُ فَحَسُنَ إِسْلَامُهُ (صلى الله عليه وسلم) say: If a person embraces Islam and makes it as sincere and serious as possible (i.e., he follows the religion of Islam in letter as well as in spirit and abstains from infidelity and other kinds of evil), then Allāh forgives يُكَفِّرُ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ كُلَّ سَيِّئَةٍ كَانَ زَلَّفَهَا all his sins which he committed before accepting Islam, (in respect of dues to Allāh only and the dues to fellow beings will remain until they are cleared).

A new account will be opened. As Allāh's وَكَانَ بَعْدَ ذَالِكَ الْقِصَاصُ mercy gets upperhand of His anger, He will be graciously pleased to reward each good deed, 10 to 700 times more. The Holy Qur'ān says:

(The likeness of those who spend their wealth in Allāh's way) is as the likeness of a grain which groweth seven ears, in every ear a hundred grains. (Qur'ān, 2:261)

كَمَثَلِ حَبَّةٍ أَنْبَتَتْ سَبْعَ سَنَابِلَ فِي كُلِّ سُنْبُلَةٍ مِّائَةُ حَبَّةٍ - (بقره، آيت ٢٦١)

Allāh has again said:

And Allāh giveth increase manifold to whom He will. (Qur'ān, 2:261)

وَاللّٰهُ يُضَاعِفُ لِمَنْ يَّشَاءُ - (بقره، آيت ٢٦١)

There is a *Ḥadīth* to the effect that if a person spends one date in the cause of Allāh, He goes on increasing it until it becomes a huge thing like the mount of Uḥud. This is really the unlimited grace of the Almighty Who appreciates the sincerity and good motive of His slaves. As regards misdeeds, the general rule is that a man will be punished to the extent of his sin, but Allāh may forgive it by His grace if He so wills.

What is the meaning of beauty of Islam:

In order to understand the excellence and beauty of Islam, it is necessary to explain whether acceptance of Islam with cordiality and sincerity mitigates all kinds of sins committed before Islam, or there are some conditions attached to it. Khaṭābī and Ibn Baṭāl claim that all leading Imāms are unanimous that Islam eliminates all sins that were committed during the period of infidelity. But this claim has not been proved. Doubtless, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Imām Mālik, Imām Shāfi'ī and majority of early and subsequent scholars maintain that Islam mitigates all kinds of sins committed during the pre-Islamic period, but Imām Aḥmad and a Shāfi'ī scholar, Ḥalīmī by name, have differed with the above view, and said that Islam eliminates those sins only for which one begs Allāh's pardons at the time of embracing religion (provided that one does not indulge in these sins after becoming Muslim). Islam does not mitigate those sins which a man continues even after accepting Islam. For example, a man indulges in adultery, theft, drinking wine, etc., after Islam, as he used to do before, his sins will not be forgiven. Imām Aḥmad says that he was surprised to know that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah held that if a person accepted Islam he would not be punished for the misdeeds committed by him in pre-Islamic period. In refutation of Abū Ḥanīfāh's view, Imām Aḥmad says:

If an infidel, after Islam, continues to indulge in those sins which he committed during the pre-Islamic period, he will be answerable for such sins. It will indicate that he begged Allāh's pardon for his disbelief only and not for his sins and misdeeds. Hence these sins will not be alleviated.

(*Fatḥul Mulhim*, Vol. I, page 271)

اَنَّ الذُّنُوْبَ الَّتِیْ كَانَ الْكَافِرُ يَفْعَلُهَا فِیْ
جَاهِلِيَّتِهٖ اِذَا اَصَرَّ عَلَيْهَا فِی الْاِسْلَامِ فَاِنَّهٗ يُؤَاخَذُ
بِهَا لِاَنَّهٗ بِاِصْرَارِهٖ لَا يَكُوْنُ تَابَ مِنْهَا وَاِنَّمَا تَابَ
مِنَ الْكُفْرِ فَلَا يَسْقُطُ عَنْهُ ذَنْبُ تِلْكَ الْمَعْصِيَةِ
لِاِصْرَارِهٖ عَلَيْهَا ۔ (فتح الملہم ص۲۷۱ ج۱)

The substance of this difference of opinions is that Imām Aḥmad maintains that Islam is a means which will be accepted as far as it goes. Before accepting Islam, repentance for disbelief is indispensable because, without it, a man's Islam will not be recognised. Now if a disbeliever seeks pardon of Allāh for his sins also, at the time of accepting Islam, his sins will be pardoned, otherwise not. On the contrary, majority of scholars hold that Islam is a source of all-pervading repentance which includes all sins and misdeeds along with disbelief and infidelity. So Islam will alleviate all misdeeds committed during the pre-Islamic period. After accepting Islam, a fresh account will be opened for every person. If he does wrong after Islam, he will be answerable, but he will not be punished for his past sins. Imām Aḥmad's argument is based on the following *Ḥadīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, narrated by 'Abdullāh bin Mas'ūd:

The people said to the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) O Prophet of Allāh! "Shall we be punished for the sins we committed before accepting Islam?" The Apostle of Allāh said: "Whosoever embraces Islam sincerely will not be punished for his past sins, and whosoever commits sins after accepting Islam will be punished for all his sins committed before accepting Islam and thereafter."

قَالَ النَّاسُ لِرَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ اَنُؤَاخَذُ بِمَا عَمِلْنَا فِی الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ
قَالَ اَمَّا مَنْ اَحْسَنَ مِنْكُمْ فِی الْاِسْلَامِ فَلَا
يُؤَاخَذُ بِهَا وَاَمَّا مَنْ اَسَاءَ اُخِذَ بِعَمَلِهٖ فِی
الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ وَالْاِسْلَامِ

This *Ḥadīth* apparently endorses Imām Aḥmad's view as the words "احسن" "he did well" and "اساء" "he did ill" are opposite terms. But the following Qur'ānic verse is against it:

Tell those who disbelieve that if they cease (from disbelief and polytheism) that which is past will be forgiven them.

(Qur'ān, 8:38)

قُلْ لِّلَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا اِنْ يَّنْتَهُوْا يُغْفَرْ لَهُمْ مَّا
قَدْ سَلَفَ، (انفال، آیۃ ۳۸)

The verse indicates that the disbelievers were told that, if they discontinued their disbelief and polytheism, all their sins (without any qualification) would be forgiven. The word "ما" in "قد سلف" is a wide term which includes all sins that were committed in the past. Moreover, this verse was revealed in order to persuade pagan Arabs to cease from all kinds of sins and crimes, and it is not proper to assume that those sins only will be pardoned in which the disbelievers would not indulge after accepting Islam. The view is supported by a *Ḥadīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* in which 'Amr bin al-'Āṣ is reported to have said :

I came to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and said to him: "Please stretch your right hand so that I may make Bay'at (allegiance) to you". When he stretched his hand I withheld mine. He said: "What is the matter with you?" I said: "I have one condition (before I make allegiance"). He said, What is that" I replied: "If you are pleased to give me a guarantee that Allāh would pardon all my sins after accepting Islam then I shall make Bay'at," He said, "Do you not know shat Islam eliminates all past sins?"

(vide. *Fatḥ al-Mulhim* Vol. I page 272)

This *Ḥadīth* does not differentiate between the sins which were repeated after accepting Islam and which were not. If forgiveness had been confined to those sins only which had not been repeated after embracing Islam, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would have mentioned this point. Some other *Aḥādīth* strengthen this point. e.g., "A man after accepting Islam becomes pure as if his mother gave birth to him today."

Ibn Shamāmah Mahrī says: "I was near 'Amr bin al-'Āṣ at the time of his death." With his face towards the wall, he was weeping. His son said, "Do you not recollect the good tidings the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) gave you?" Turning his face to his son, he said; "My son! My confession and belief in oneness of Allāh and Prophethood of Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) are the highest gift (or blessing) for me. My life has three periods. In the first period I was deadly opposed to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and wished to kill him. Had I died in this period I would have been certainly cast into Hell. In the second period I embraced Islam and heard from the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that my sins would be pardoned. During this period I was so much enamoured of the Holy Prophet's personal charms and incomparable merits that I could not dare to cast a glance at him. Had I died in this period of my life, I hope I would have been in Paradise. The present is the third period of my life. When I assumed the reign of administration, I cannot say what is in store for me? It is possible that I may be liable to chastisement on some account, and my good work of the second period may go in vain."

'Amr bin al-'Āṣ was appointed Governor of 'Ammān by the Holy Prophet. (صلى الله عليه وسلم) He was commander of the army that conquered Egypt during the Caliphate of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar. He was Governor of Egypt for four years during the Caliphate of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar and for the same period during the Caliphate of Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān, and for two years during the reign for Ḥaḍrat Mu'āwiyah. At the time of his death 'Amr bin al-'Āṣ asked his son to bind his hands and his neck with rope, and then raising his head towards the heaven, he ('Amr bin al-'Āṣ) exclaimed, "O my Lord! I could not carry out thy commandments and prohibitions. I am before Thee just like a criminal, but I believe that there is no god save Thee and Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is your slave and Apostle," saying this he breathed his last.

Similarly, when Ḥaḍrat 'Usāmah bin Zayd killed a person after the latter had recited Kalima-i-Shahādat (There is no god but Allāh), the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) chided him seriously. Then Ḥaḍrat 'Usāmah said: "How I wish I had embraced Islam today only." From this statement, it is clear that Islam eliminates all past sins in general, without any discrimination. Apart from the above, it seems below the dignity and incomparable grace of Allāh that He once pardons a man's sins on account of his acceptance of Islam and afterwards punishes him for those very sins which he pardoned before. This is the view of majority of leading Imāms. There are several answers to Imām Aḥmad's theory, for which Ibn Mas'ūd's *Ḥadīth* (narrated in Ṣaḥiḥ Muslim) was quoted above. Firstly, Khaṭābī says that by "Mu'ākhadhah" in the *Ḥadīth* is meant rebuking, chiding, etc. (and not actual punishment). Then the substance of the *Ḥadīth* will be that, if a person accepted Islam, he would not be answerable for his past sins, but if after Islam he repeated the old habits of committing major sins and crimes, he would be punished for the same (the sins he committed after being Muslim) but he would be scolded and rebuked for those sins which he had committed during the time of his disbelief. Secondly, some scholars say that by the word "Asā'a" in the above *Ḥadīth*, *disbelief and apostasy* is meant. Now the meaning of the *Ḥadīth* will be that, whosoever relapsed into disbelief and apostasy after having accepted Islam, will be like one who has not accepted Islam sincerely. Hence he will be punished for all his sins like other unbelievers. Imām Bukhārī has pointed to this view by narrating the above *Ḥadīth* of 'Abdullāh bin Mas'ūd after the *Ḥadīth* "اکبر الکبائر الشرک" (The greatest major sin is polytheism) towards the end of the chapter on "المرتدين" (apostates). Thirdly, Qurṭabī and 'Abdul Malik Būnī mean "Nifāq" (hypocrisy) by the word "Asā'a" in the above *Ḥadīth*. Then the *Ḥadīth* will mean that Islam with hypocrisy will not mitigate the sins committed during the pre-Islamic period. Fourthly, the best answer is that the above *Ḥadīth* does not mean that a Muslim will be punished for the sins he committed before Islam (as they were already forgiven on account of his acceptance of Islam). This may be explained by an example. A magistrate may pardon a man for theft in the first instance or in two or three instances but when he realises that the culprit is persisting in theft, he inflicts severe punishment on him. This severe punishment does not mean that he is punished for the thefts previously committed because the magistrate had already released him before. The enhanced punishment is given for the culprit's past theft (and his persistence in guilt) in order to stop its recurrence in future. This is exactly what is understood by the sentence.

"He would be liable for chastisement for his sins committed during the pre-Islamic and post-Islamic periods". Now the expression "فحسن اسلامه" "(He accepted Islam sincerely)," according to majority of learned divines, will apply to such persons as are sincere (devoid of hypocrisy) in embracing Islam and continuance in that condition till the end of their lives; and according to Imām Aḥmad it will apply to those persons also who abstain from all sins and do not indulge frequently in any sin after accepting Islam (as he understood it by the above *Ḥadīth* of 'Abdullāh bin Mas'ūd).

Why did Bukhari omit the second part of the *Ḥadīth*

Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī's *Ḥadīth*. 'اذا اسلم العبد فحسن اسلامه يكفر الله عنه كل سيئة كان زلفها' "When a man embraces Islam and does it well, Allāh forgives all the sins he committed before, i.e., before Islam," includes the following passage also:—''كتب الله له كل حسنة زلفها'' "Allāh records all good work which he did before i.e., before Islam". This additional passage is included in Imām Mālik's *Gharīb Aḥādīth* (those *Aḥādīth* which have come down to us through one transmitter) narrated by Dār Quṭnī in nine different ways. Hence this may be considered as correct. Now the question is 'why did not Imām Bukhārī include this additional passage in his above ***Ḥadīth***'? Several replies are given. Firstly, Imām Bukhārī did not know it. Secondly, he knew it, but he intentionally did not mention it because it conflicted with the unanimous opinion of the people of *Sunnat wal Jamā'at*, viz. no good work of a disbeliever carries any weight before Allāh, because good motive is a pre-requisite for all religious rituals and for approach to Allāh, which is absent in case of those who disbelieve in the Divine Being.

But this reply is not correct. There is no justification for omitting part of a ***Ḥadīth*** on the ground that it contradicts the opinion of majority of Muslim scholars. There are several *Aḥādīth* in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, on which the people of ***Sunnat*** *wal* *Jamā'at* do not act, but as their chains of transmitters are reliable, they have been mentioned in that book. It may, however, be said that save Imām Mālik, no ***Muḥaddith*** (Traditionist) has narrated the additional portion of the above *Ḥadīth*, and hence it is called one of the *Gharīb Aḥādīth* of Imām Mālik. Therefore Imām Bukhārī has omitted it.

Now there are two points to be considered here (i), whether a Muslim convert will get any reward for the good work he did in pre-Islamic period or not, and (ii) whether a disbeliever who dies as a disbeliever will get a reward for any good deed he did during the period of his infidelity, or not. It goes without saying that all unbelievers are not equal. Some of them are very kind-hearted and good-natured, and others are not so.

Opinions regarding the good work of disbelievers

It is well-known that good work done during the period of infidelity will not be rewarded, even when one accepts Islam afterwards. The reason, as stated earlier, is that good motive is a pre-requisite for the performance of all religious duties and for seeking knowledge of Allāh; and an infidel is deprived of it. But two *Aḥādīth* are contrary to this view. The first *Ḥadīth* of Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī has already been discussed above. The second *Ḥadīth* of Ḥakīm bin Ḥizām, narrated in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, in the chapter on "Opinion regarding the work of a disbeliever when he accepts Islam," is given below:

He (Ḥakīm bin Ḥizām) said to the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*): "Please tell me whether I shall get anything for the good work I did in the pre-Islamic period." The Apostle told him: "You embraced Islam with the good deed you did (i.e. you will be rewarded for the good work you did before Islam)".

أَرَأَيْتَ أُمُورًا كُنْتُ أَتَحَنَّثُ بِهَا فِي الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ
هَلْ لِي فِيهَا مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَسْلَمْتَ عَلَى مَا أَسْلَفْتَ مِنْ خَيْرٍ۔

Māzarī says that this ***Ḥadīth*** appears to be contrary to the general rule because a non-Muslim does not believe in Allāh, nor has he any knowledge of Allāh. Consequently, his good work cannot have any value. Without having knowledge of, and belief in the Supreme Being, all good deeds of a man are meaningless. Hence learned scholars have explained this *Ḥadīth* in several ways. Firstly, the sentence, "اسلمت علی ما اسلفت" means that you have profited by your good work which has improved your nature and habits. Secondly, you deserved praise for your good deeds in the pre-Islamic period, and you deserve the same now also. Thirdly, it was due to your good deeds that you were prompted to accept Islam. Fourthly, on account of your good work during the period of infidelity, you will get increase in your means of livelihood. One *Ḥadīth* of Ḥaḍrat Anas, narrated by Imām Muslim, says: "An unbeliever is rewarded with livelihood in this world on account of the good work he does." Ibn Baṭāl and some other scholars of *Ḥadīth* are of the opinion that the *Ḥadīth* should be used in its literal sense, i.e., a non-believer who accepts Islam and dies on Islam, will be rewarded for the good work he did in the pre-Islamic period. The word "علی" in the *Ḥadīth* "علی ما اسلفت" may be taken in the sense of "with", and then the *Ḥadīth* will mean that 'you accepted Islam along with all good deeds you did in the pre-Islamic period' (i.e., your good work will remain intact, and will open doors for further improvement). If the word "علی" in the *Ḥadīth* is used in the sense of "on" (as it literally means), the *Ḥadīth* will mean that 'you were prompted to accept Islam on the basis of your good work in the past, (i.e., when your good work of the pre-Islamic period was useful your good work of post-Islamic period will be, all the more, beneficial).

In short, the two *Aḥādīth*, mentioned above, clearly support the view that a man after accepting Islam, will be rewarded for the good work he did before. Now the objection that this view is contrary to the opinion of majority of scholars, is to be considered.

Ibnul Munīr says that learned scholars of *Ḥadīth* are unanimous that no worship or good work of an infidel will be acceptable during the period of infidelity, but they are not unanimous regarding the rejection of the same (i.e., work done during the pre-Islamic period) after one accepts Islam. Nor is it against the general rule. As a matter of fact, Allāh is the most Merciful and most Compassionate Who confers favours on His slaves without any work to their credit (as many *Aḥādīth* indicate). He is sometimes pleased to convert our evil deeds into good deeds as the Qur'ān says:

As for such, Allāh will change their evil deeds to good deeds. (Qur'ān, 25:70)	فَاُولٰٓئِكَ يُبَدِّلُ اللّٰهُ سَيِّاٰتِهِمْ حَسَنٰتٍ ؕ (فرقان، آیت ٧٠)

In the light of the above, it can be safely assumed that Allāh, the most Gracious, may reward an unbeliever's good work, done before Islam, after he accepts the same without any pre-requisite whatsoever. Learned scholars generally assert that if a non-Muslim sincerely believes in Allāh and His Prophet, and follows the teachings of Islam regularly, it is expected that his good work done in pre-Islamic period will be accepted by Allāh. This explanation is not against the unanimous opinion of Muslim scholars. Allāh is so Gracious that if a person intended to do a certain good work but he could not do it for any reason, he will be rewarded for his good intention. For example, if a person intended to offer *Tahajjud* prayers but he could not awake after mid-night, or a man could not join congregational prayers despite his intentions, Allāh will be pleased to reward him for his good motive (though without work). There is a *Ḥadīth* to the effect that when a person will be presented before Allāh on the Day of Judgement, He will ask him about minor sins, and he will confess them and then will fear about major sins; but Allāh will tell him, "Go, I have forgiven all your sins and changed them into good deeds."

There is one *Ḥadīth* to the effect that the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) was asked about Ibn Jud'ān and his good deeds whether they would profit him. The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) replied, "He did not say a single day, O my Lord! Forgive my sins in the Hereafter".

سُئِلَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَنِ ابْنِ جُدْعَانَ وَمَا كَانَ يَصْنَعُهُ مِنَ الْخَيْرِ هَلْ يَنْفَعُهُ فَقَالَ اِنَّهُ لَمْ يَقُلْ يَوْمًا رَبِّ اغْفِرْلِىْ خَطِيْئَتِىْ يَوْمَ الدِّيْنِ ۔

It can be easily inferred from this *Ḥadīth* that if Ibn Jud'ān had begged Allāh's pardon, his good deeds of the past would have profited him.

Good deeds devoid of spirit

It is established that good deeds of disbelievers will benefit them in this world as the Holy Qur'ān says about disbelievers :

Whoso desireth the life of the world and its pomp, We shall repay them their deeds herein, and therein they will not be wronged. (Qur'ān, 11:15)

مَنْ كَانَ يُرِيْدُ الْحَيٰوةَ الدُّنْيَا وَزِيْنَتَهَا نُوَفِّ اِلَيْهِمْ اَعْمَالَهُمْ فِيْهَا وَهُمْ فِيْهَا لَا يُبْخَسُوْنَ ؕ (ہود آیت ۱۵)

It is also said for the infidels when after لا یبخسون Allāh says :

Those are they for whom is naught in the Hereafter save the Fire. (All) that they contrive here is vain and (all) that they are wont to do is fruitless. (Qur'ān, 11:16,)

اُولٰٓئِكَ الَّذِيْنَ لَيْسَ لَهُمْ فِى الْاٰخِرَةِ اِلَّا النَّارُ ۖ وَحَبِطَ مَا صَنَعُوْا فِيْهَا وَبٰطِلٌ مَّا كَانُوْا يَعْمَلُوْنَ ۝ (ہود، آیت ۱۶)

The substance of these verses is that, if a person does not believe in Allāh and does not follow the teachings of the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth* and confines all his activities and efforts to this world and its pomp, then Allāh may reward him in this world for any good work done by him in this world according to His Will. Similarly, if a Jew or a Christian or a hypocritical Musalmān etc. spends money in the name of charity but really for name and fame only, Allāh may favour him in this world, in any way He likes. From *Aḥādīth* it transpires that good work done by disbelievers in the world will be rewarded by Him in this world in the manner He likes. He may enhance their wealth, increase the number of their children, improve their health, and so on, But on the Day of Judgment nothing will save them from the doom of Allāh. The Holy Qur'ān says:

Whoso desireth that (life) which hasteneth away, We hasten for him therein that We will for whom We please. (Qur'ān, 17:18)

مَنْ كَانَ يُرِيْدُ الْعَاجِلَةَ عَجَّلْنَا لَهٗ فِيْهَا مَا نَشَآءُ لِمَنْ نُّرِيْدُ (بنی اسرائیل، آیت ۱۸)

And, at the same time, it has also been said about the infidels.

And afterward We have appointed for him hell; he will endure the heat thereof, condemned, rejected. (Qur'ān, 17:18)

ثُمَّ جَعَلْنَا لَهٗ جَهَنَّمَ ۚ يَصْلٰهَا مَذْمُوْمًا مَّدْحُوْرًا ۝ (بنی اسرائیل، آیت ۱۸)

It must be born in mind that the people who discard the Qur'ān and disobey Allāh on account of their absorption, in worldly affairs, will not get more than what is destined for them in the world. Allāh favours such people according to necessity or expediency, so that they may obtain the fruits of their labour in this world, but in the Hereafter, they will be disgraced and cast into Hell for perpetual residence there There is a *Hadīth* of Hadrat Anas to the effect that a disbeliever is rewarded in this world for his good deeds here, but when he leaves the world, he is devoid of all sorts of good work (*Sahīh Muslim*).

Good deeds of a disbeliever and benefits in the Hereafter

Muslim divines and scholars are unanimous that the good work of a disbeliever will not save him from Hell where he will have to reside perpetually. But there is difference of opinion whether his good deeds will profit him in the Hereafter in any other way or not. Some scholars say that all infidels, whether they do good or bad work here, will be subject to the same kind of punishment, and no work of a disbeliever, however excellent otherwise it might be, will be taken into account, in the Hereafter. But some prominent scholars, who have studied the subject thoroughly, hold that infidels will profit by their good work on the Day of Resurrection to some extent, viz. a disbeliever who is just, reasonable and kind in this world, will have less severe punishment in the Hereafter than an infidel who is unjust, unreasonable and cruel here (though both will remain in Hell permanently). The Holy Qur'ān says:

And We set a just balance for the Day of Resurrection so that no soul is wronged in aught. (Qur'ān, 21:47)	وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِيْنَ الْقِسْطَ لِيَوْمِ الْقِيٰمَةِ فَلَا تُظْلَمُ نَفْسٌ شَيْئًا ، (انبیار، آیت ۴۷)

This verse clearly indicates that good-natured and cruel-hearted infidels will not have equally severe punishment in the Hereafter. Further, the fact that there are several stages of Hell proves this view. The Qur'ān says:

Lo! the hypocrites (will be) in the lowest deep of the fire. (Qur'ān, 4:145)	اِنَّ الْمُنٰفِقِيْنَ فِى الدَّرْكِ الْاَسْفَلِ مِنَ النَّارِ - (نسار، آیت ۱۴۵)

This verse denotes that a hypocritical unbeliever will be punished more severely than a plain disbeliever. Though Abū Ṭālib and Abū Jahl both died in the state of disbelief, the former's punishment will be less severe than that of the latter (as stated in reliable *Hadīth*). Similarly, Abū Lahab, who was the bitterest enemy of the Holy Prophet, will get reward for having liberated his slave girl, Thuwaybah, who had first given him the good tidings of the Prophet's birth. It is narrated in *Sahīh Bukhārī*, (chapter on Marriage).

'Urwah said: Abū Lahab was seen in a dream, in which he said: "I have not seen any good thing here save the one which I got as a reward for my liberating Thuwaybah.

Alleviation of punishment

What is said above conflicts with the following verses of the Qur'ān:

Nor is its torment lightened for them (disbelievers). (Qur'ān, 35:36)	لَا يُخَفَّفُ عَنْهُمْ مِّنْ عَذَابِهَا (فاطر، آیت ۳۶)
Their punishment will not be lightened (Qur'ān, 2:86)	لَا يُخَفَّفُ عَنْهُمُ الْعَذَابُ (بقرہ، آیت ۸۶)

This conflict is however, removed by maintaining that alleviation of punishment (wherever granted by Allāh) will be trifling so much so that the people concerned will not feel relief worth the name. The following *Ḥadīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is notable:

Nu'mān bin Bashīr narrates that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said: The least torture for a person who will be hurled into the Fire will be that he shall be made to wear two shoes and two shoe-laces of fire, and his brain will seeth like the seething of boiling water in a pot. He will think that none will get a more severe punishment than that, whereas his punishment will be the lightest of all.

Alleviation of punishment in the beginning and in the end :

In my opinion, the best answer is that punishment may be lightened in the beginning or towards the end. For example, a culprit is awarded heavy punishment while another less, by a Magistrate. This is an alleviation in the beginning. After sometime, the Magistrate lightened the severe punishment of the former criminal. This is concession towards the end. Our discourse relates to the first form of alleviation. i.e. in the beginning. some persons will be awarded light punishments; whereas the Qur'ānic verse means that punishment, once awarded to any person, will not be lighted on any account, as it is generally given in the affairs of the world. Thus there is no conflict between the two views. The *Ḥadīth* of Ḥaḍrat Anas mentioned above 'حتیٰ اذا افضیٰ الی الاخرة لم تکن له حسنة' also means the same thing, i.e. when a disbeliever leaves the world, he is deprived of all sorts of good work (which could profit him). It is supported by the Qur'ānic verse "وحبط ماصنعوا فیها و باطل ما کانوا یعملون" All that they contrive here is vain and (all) that they are wont to do is fruitless. (Qur'ān, 11:16)

Thus there are two points here, viz (i) To consider favourably any act of worship on the part of a disbeliever. This is impossible because a good motive is a prerequisite for the acceptance of all acts of devotion, and this is absent in case of disbelievers; and (ii) In view of Allāh's unlimited grace, it is not impossible that some disbelievers may be rewarded by Him for some good decds.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE BEST OBEDIENCE TO ALLĀH, THE MOST EXALTED, IS ONE WHICH IS PERPETUAL

41. We have been told by Muḥammad bin al-Muthannā who said that he was informed by Yaḥyā via Hishām that the latter said: My father, 'Urwah heard :

✶ Ḥaḍrat 'Ā'ishah say :

"The Holy Proyhet (*sallullāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) came to me while a woman was with me. He said, "Who is she"? I replied. "She is so and so and I made mention of her prayers". He said "Do as much as you have capacity to do (for all times). By Allāh, He does not get tired (of favouring you with rewards), but you will be tired, and the best obedience to Allāh is one which is perpetual."

بَابٌ 32 اَحَبُّ الدِّيْنِ اِلَى اللّٰهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ اَدْوَمُهٗ۔

41۔ حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْمُثَنّٰى قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا
يَحْيٰى عَنْ هِشَامٍ قَالَ اَخْبَرَنِیْ اَبِیْ عَنْ عَائِشَةَ
اَنَّ النَّبِیَّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ دَخَلَ عَلَيْهَا وَعِنْدَهَا
اِمْرَاَةٌ قَالَ مَنْ هٰذِهٖ قَالَتْ فُلَانَةُ تَذْكُرُ مِنْ
صَلَاتِهَا قَالَ مَهْ عَلَيْكُمْ بِمَا تُطِيْقُوْنَ فَوَاللّٰهِ لَا
يَمَلُّ اللّٰهُ حَتّٰى تَمَلُّوْا وَكَانَ اَحَبَّ الدِّيْنِ اِلَيْهِ مَا
دَاوَمَ عَلَيْهِ صَاحِبُهٗ ÷

Object of the *Ḥadīth*

Different stages of the Faith, on the basis of various degrees of beauty, were mentioned before, and now different stages of the same on the basis of what deed are the best and most lovely near Allāh and what is otherwise is described. The meaning of the *Ḥadīth* is that the quality of work should be our object rather than the quantity thereof. Obviously, that work is the best and most lovely which is done regularly and punctually even though it may be small in quantity. The religion of Islam stresses the importance of regular devotion to Allāh side by side with our duties and responsibilities in the world, so that one must not stand in the way of the other.

Hafiz Ibn Hajar's view

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that Imām Bukhārī argues by this *Ḥadīth* that belief applies to action because in his opinion, religion and belief have the same meaning and by religion here '*amal* (work) is meant. Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib, describing the connection of this *Ḥadīth* with the preceding chapter, says that Imām Bukhārī intends to warn that those good deeds are the main objects of a Muslim which are done perpetually and sincerely.

Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah says that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) once came to her when a woman, Khaulā', daughter of Tuwait, was sitting there. She made mention of Khaulā's excessive prayers to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). If the word "تذکر" in the *Ḥadīth* is in the active voice, the meaning will be that Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah described the excessive prayers of Khaulā' to the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم); and if "یذکر" is in the passive voice, the meaning of the *Ḥadīth* will be that she was known generally for her continuous prayers. Anyhow, the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said that all acts of worship must be done within one's capacity and that one must prolong them till the end of one's life. The word مہ in the *Ḥadīth* is اسم فعل and means 'wait and see.' If this word is addressed to Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah then it will mean that the Prophet wanted her not to praise any person on his face. If this word is directed to Khaulā' it will mean that the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) advised her not to pray excessively but limit her acts of worship within her capacity.

Praise on one's face

It is said that it is disallowed to praise any one on his face. Why did, then, Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah praise Khaulā'? The above *Ḥadīth* is mentioned in *Fatḥ al-Bārī* on the basis of the Musnad of Ḥasan bin Sufyān as follows :

There was a woman near me, when she stood (i.e. departed), the Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said : "Who is she"?	كَانَتْ عِنْدِی امْرَاَةٌ فَلَمَّا قَامَتْ قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّی اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مَنْ هٰذِهٖ؟

This shows that Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah praised Khaulā' after the latter's departure and not on her presence. Moreover, it is not known with certainty that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) disallowed praise on one's face before the above incident. Again, if he did so before, it is to be ascertained whether Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah knew it or not. Possibly she came to know of it for the first time when the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) asked her about Khaulā'. It may also be said that Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah did not want to praise Khaulā'. She wanted to get guidance and instruction from the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) after having stated the simple fact.

The purpose of this *Ḥadīth* is to warn the people against excessive acts of worship which often result in weariness and fatigue. If a person worships Allāh within the scope of his capacity, he may prolong it till the end of his life. Otherwise he may possibly be disgusted with his excessive acts of devotion and then discontinues them. Perpetuation of good work, though in small quantity, is appreciated by Allāh.

The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said "By Allāh, Allāh does not get tired (of giving you rewards) but you will be tired (of your excessive acts of worship)".

It is hardly necessary to say that the created beings only get tired of their work, and never Allāh. Why then has this expression been used in connection with Allāh? Ḥāfiẓ 'Aynī says that it is only a figurative expression. Similar words have been used in different senses.

For example, the Qur'ān says :

The guerdon of an ill-deed is an ill the like thereof. (Qur'ān, 42:40)

جَزَاءُ سَيِّئَةٍ سَيِّئَةٌ مِّثْلُهَا (شوریٰ، آیت ۴۰)

As a matter of fact, an ill in return of a similar ill is not really an ill, though it appears to be so. 'Allāmah 'Aynī quotes another Qur'ānic verse:

Attack him in like manner as he attacked you. (Qur'ān, 2:194)

فَاعْتَدُوا عَلَيْهِ بِمِثْلِ مَا اعْتَدَىٰ عَلَيْكُمْ (بقرہ آیت ۱۹۴)

If disbelievers attack you (Muslims) in violation of forbidden months and sanctity of the Ḥaram (Ka'bah), you should also attack them in return. Obviously, this retaliation in such cases is not an evil act, though in form it may so appear. This is a figurative form of expression. Khaṭābī says that the word "to get tired" in the *Ḥadīth* is a compressed similie i.e. weariness or fatigue generally causes an abandonment of work. The verse means that Allāh does not abandon awarding favours to His created beings. Some scholars say that the verse means that as Allāh does not get tired of giving rewards, it is not proper for human beings to show that he is tired. However, the tradition of Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah in the case that a man's efforts can go to a certain extent only but Allāh's rewards have no bounds and limits.

CHAPTER XXXIII
INCREASE AND DECREASE IN IMĀN

And Allāh, the Exalted, said, "And We increased them in guidance. (Qur'ān, 18:13)

And that Believers may increase in Faith. (Qur'ān, 74:31)

Allāh said: "This day I have perfected your religion for you". (Qur'ān, 5:3)

If any body leaves part of a perfect thing i.e. religion, it remains defective.

42. We have been told by Muslim ibn Ibrāhīm who said that he was informed by Hishām who said: Qatādah narrated the following via.

✶ Ḥaḍrat Anas who heard the Prophet of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say: "Whosoever says (sincerely) there is no god but Allāh and has in his heart good (Faith) of the weight of a grain of barley, will get out of Hell (one day). And whosoever says (sincerely) that there is no god save Allāh and has in his heart good (Faith) of the weight of a grain of wheat will get out of Hell (one day). And whosoever says (sincerely) that there is no god but Allāh and has in his heart good (Faith) of the weight of an atom will get out of Hell (one day),

بابٌ 33 زيادة الإيمان ونقصانه

وقول الله تعالى وزدناهم هدى ويزداد الذين آمنوا إيمانا وقال اليوم أكملت لكم دينكم فإذا ترك شيئا من الكمال فهو ناقص ؞

42۔ حدثنا مسلم بن إبراهيم قال حدثنا هشام قال حدثنا قتادة عن أنس عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال يخرج من النار من قال لا إله إلا الله وفي قلبه وزن شعيرة من خير ويخرج من النار من قال لا إله إلا الله وفي قلبه وزن برة من خير ويخرج من النار من قال لا إله إلا الله وفي قلبه وزن ذرة من خير قال أبو عبد الله قال أبان حدثنا قتادة حدثنا أنس عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من إيمان مكان خير ؞

Bukhārī says: Abān said that he was informed by Qatādah that Anas heard the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho* '*alaihi wa sallam*) say, "*Imān* instead of *khayr*".

43. We have been told by al-Ḥasan bin al-Ṣabāḥ who heard from Ja'far bin 'Aun say that Abul 'Umays said: Qays bin Muslim told us via Ṭāriq bin Shihab that:

✶ 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb narrated : "Once a Jew said to me; O Commander of the Faithful! There is a verse in your book which you all read, and if this verse had been revealed to us, the Jewish community, we would have observed that day as an 'Id day (or a day of festival)" 'Umar asked: "Which verse do you mean?" Then he replied, "This day I have perfected your religion for you and completed My favour unto you, and have chosen for you as religion "al-Islam". (Qur'ān, 5:3)

'Umar said: "We know the day and the place where this verse was revealed to the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho* '*alaihi wa sallam*). It was on Friday and the Prophet (*ṣallallāho* '*alaihi wa sallam*) was then standing at '*Arafāt*".

43- حَدَّثَنَا الْحَسَنُ بْنُ الصَّبَّاحِ سَمِعَ جَعْفَرَ بْنَ عَوْنٍ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْعُمَيْسِ أَخْبَرَنَا قَيْسُ بْنُ مُسْلِمٍ عَنْ طَارِقِ بْنِ شِهَابٍ عَنْ عُمَرَ بْنِ الْخَطَّابِ أَنَّ رَجُلًا مِّنَ الْيَهُودِ قَالَ لَهُ يَا أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ آيَةٌ فِي كِتَابِكُمْ تَقْرَءُونَهَا لَوْ عَلَيْنَا مَعْشَرَ الْيَهُودِ نَزَلَتْ لَاتَّخَذْنَا ذَالِكَ الْيَوْمَ عِيدًا قَالَ أَيُّ آيَةٍ قَالَ الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتْمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا قَالَ عُمَرُ قَدْ عَرَفْنَا ذَالِكَ الْيَوْمَ وَالْمَكَانَ الَّذِي نَزَلَتْ فِيهِ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَهُوَ قَائِمٌ بِعَرَفَةَ يَوْمَ جُمُعَةٍ

Connection

Ḥāfiẓ Badruddin 'Aynī has connected this chapter with the one, in so far as the last chapter made the deed a desirable occurrence which required continuity. Now Imām Bukhārī discusses the waxing and waning of faith. 'Ainī says that undoubtedly faith waxes on account of continued practice of religious injunctions. And if laxity is shown in their practice, then the faith shrinks. This is according to the doctrines of Imām Bukhārī and a group of Traditionists. And this view is also held by those who do not believe in the waxing and waning of faith with the difference that according to that, waxing and waning take place in the attributes and not in the nature of faith itself as "كما عرف فى موضعه. عمدة القارى ٢٥٨ ج ١".

Doubt of repetition and its removal

Imām Bukhārī has tried to prove in this chapter "تفاضل اهل الایمان" "the preference of the faithful" reproducing a Tradition from Abū Sā'īd Khudrī, what he has proved by a Tradition from Anas. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar in justifying this repetition says that the waxing and waning of faith had both the possibilities due to deeds or due to verbal confirmation. So Imām Bukhārī reproduced both the versions. Then in the beginning of the Chapter on the Faith under the title, "باب بنى الاسلام على خمس" he has already discussed the subject that faith waxes and wanes. Now he comes to the subject of "باب زیادة الایمان و نقصانه" This shows doubt of repetition and several answers have explained it in different ways. Some have pointed out that the question of waxing and waning here relates to the nature of the faith but, at the previous place, it was not so. Only it cropped up incidentally. As the sentence, "الایمان قول و فعل ویزید وینقص" is well known in this form, so it was mentioned in relation to verbal affirmation and deed. So he did not quote any Tradition in support of his argument. But since here it is intended to discuss the issue in all its details, so he quoted explicit Traditions relevant to the issue. Yet other writers point out merely the difference in the headings. In the first place, the waxing and waning of Islam was meant but here it is to prove the waxing and waning of faith.

According to Imām Bukhārī as Islma and faith are co-existent, so he uses at some place, the word, 'Islam' and at other place, the word, "faith." After "بنى الاسلام" he used the sentence, meaning thereby, that Islam is subject to waxing and waning. Thus he named the Chapter "زيادة الايمان و نقصانه". We do not deny the waxing and waning of Islam but the point at issue, is faith. So Imām Bukhārī has discussed problem of waxing and waning of faith just after the "بنى الاسلام" (foundation of faith).

Comment on Imam Bukhari's arguments

Imām Bukhārī has quoted three verses of the Qur'ān in support of his arguments. The first two verses are those as have already been referred to, in the Chapter on Faith. The third verse means, 'اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم': "Today I have perfected your religion and have completed My blessings upon you and have selected Islam as your religion." Thus it is sheer stupidity to accept or wait for any other religion after this perfect and universal religion has been revealed. Islam means duty and submission and there is no salvation outside of it. Imām Bukhārī's argument based on this verse is, "When a part is left out of the whole, the whole is incomplete."

Thus the verse shows that before this verse was revealed, religion was incomplete and so it admitted waxing and waning in itself.

In this argument the word 'incomplete' has been used, but it is not a suitable word; I style it as not perfect, although the result is the same. It means that, before the revelation of this verse, faith was imperfect and it also shows that, henceforth, religion has been perfected in all its details. First, a part was revealed, then another, and finally, when the whole was revealed, this verse came to perfect it. But this does not imply that, at the time when the early verses were revealed, the faithful, who accepted the faith had a defective religion, for they practised all those obligations which had been so far revealed. So it is not necessary to conclude that those faithful who died in the early days of Islam had an imperfect faith. Taking this line, could it be said that the faith and religion of the martyrs of Badr were incomplete and defective? No, it is not so. However, it can be said that their faith had a general and total aspect but had not much details. At this point, the words of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah may be quoted, "they accepted the faith in general and the details came later on." Thus their faith was not incomplete and they are considered far better than many who participated in the conquest of Makkah. They had not practised the faith any less, for they believed that the part religion already revealed was just and good, and the part coming subsequently, would be, likewise, good and just. It is true that they could not act upto those details. There were some persons who got the opportunity to live upto their faith according to the revelation of the time. Yet those coming after, got more opportunities to practise their faith for they had ampler revelations to live by. Now the perfection depends on the practice of religion revealed in their times. It is therefore, not possible to characterise imperfect faith of those who lived in the early part of revelation as compared to those who lived in the final part of revelation. For this defect or incompleteness is not real, but it may be styled as relative due to the difference in time. Now this waxing and waning is not concerned with the inherent nature of the problem, for the real faith is to attest which has been revealed to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Hadrat Anas has reported that all those who had sincerely recited the formula that there is no god but Allāh and who had faith to the extent of a grain of wheat, or barley or an atom, would be taken out from the hell And the word 'goodness' may mean faith and also those qualities which are associated with faith.

A question, however, may be raised here that the issue here concerned the waxing and waning of faith and the word, "goodness" meant the waxing and waning of goodness which is an attribute of action. This shows that the waxing and waning is not in the faith. So Imām Bukhārī in citing the Tradition by Abū 'Abdullāh and Abān, says that Abān has reported the tradition of Anas through Qatādah in which instead of the word, "goodness," the word "faith" has been used. This clearly shows that the word (goodness) means faith. This also has an advantage that Qatādah is "مدلس" and if he had not been credited with the hearingof the *Hadīth*, his "عنعنه" (his references about the chain of reporters) would not have been acceptable but this Tradition had the chain of reporters. So Imām Bukhārī after citing the chain of reporters explained the Tradition. Here Hāfiz ibn Hajar has mentioned a doubt that when Qatādah has explicitly mentioned the Tradition through Abān, Imām Bukhārī should have mentioned the report by Abān. It is not understood why he quoted the Tradition of Hishām which had full chain of reporters from Qatādah, in the first part of the chapter and then explained it, after quoting relevant tradition. Hāfiz ibn Hajar, however, has given an explanation to it that, although, both Hishām and Abān are trustworthy, yet the position of Hishām is higher than Abān in the matter of trustworthy report. So Imām Bukhārī reported the Tradition from Hishām but explained it to remove its defect. Ibn Hajar says that one advantage of this has been the determination of the fact of hearing and the other advantage to fix the meaning of the word, "goodness". Imām Bukhārī has quoted the Tradition reported by Anas and in the Chapter on "باب تفاضل اهل الايمان" further cited the report of Abū Sa'īd Khudrī. Both have the same subject, and both have been already discussed before.

Imām Bukhārī in support of his view that faith waxes and wanes has quoted one more Tradition. A great learned Jew of Syria, once asked Hadrat 'Umar that "there is a certain verse in the Qur'ān recited by you but you do not set great value to it." In some report the words (occur) which show that Ka'b al-ahbār was accompanied by a few persons, Ka'b said, "O Commander of the Faithful! if this verse had been revealed to us, we would have celebrated the day of its revelation as a day of our rejoicing." Thereupon, Hadrat 'Umar asked him what that verse, was. The Jew replied.

This day I have perfected your religion for you and Completed My favour unto you, and have chosen for you as religion Al-Islam.

اَلْيَوْمَ اَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِيْنَكُمْ وَاَتْمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ"
نِعْمَتِيْ وَرَضِيْتُ لَكُمُ الْاِسْلَامَ دِيْنًا (مائدہ، آیت ۳)

The point is that the person who raised the question, very well understood the significance of the verse and made a good choice from the Qur'ān. Thus religion was made perfect and all the blessings of God were completed. This verse is a blessing of God among other blessings. Hadrat 'Umar replied that he knew the place, the day and the time of its revelation. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was in 'Arafāt that day and the day was Friday.

Probably you do not know that, on the day of revelation of this verse, in fact, two 'Īds (day of rejoicing and festivity) had occurred for the Muslims. This verse was revealed on the tenth of Hijrī on the occasion of the Ḥajjatul-Wadā' (last pilgrimage of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and secondly, it was on the day of 'Arafah, on Friday, in the evening ('*Aṣr*) when more than forty-thousand pious and noble people had gathered at the plain of 'Arafāt around the she-camel of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The following words are additional in the narration of Ṭibrānī:

"This verse was revealed between Friday and the day of '*Arafah*; both these days are, by the Grace of God, 'Id for us." (Ṭibrānī)

نَزَلَتْ يَوْمَ جُمُعَةٍ يَوْمَ عَرَفَةَ وَكِلَاهُمَا بِحَمْدِ اللهِ لَنَا عِيْدٌ (طبرانى)

The intention of Ḥadrat 'Umar was to show that the Jew (as they said) would have celebrated the day as 'Īd but God had revealed this verse on the day which constituted double 'Īd for the Muslims. Friday is the 'Īd day for the week and '*Arafah* is the annual 'Īd day (of pilgrimage). One is the 'Īd of the Muslims and the other is the greatest day of rejoicing for the entire Islamic world. Hence, this verse is of great importance to us. Its glory and its memory will remain alive till the Last Day. Further, this 'Īd is not temporary and short-lived but it is permanent. It is not determined by man but is a gift from God, Almighty.

A doubt may arise as to how two 'Īds took place, since the yearly 'Īd falls on the tenth of Dhil-Ḥajj and the day of '*Arafah* is on the ninth. It is clarified in this way that the customary 'Īd falls on the tenth but the real 'Īd falls on the day of '*Arafah*. This is why it has been said, that Ḥajj is given the name for the stay at '*Arafāt*.

A question is asked as to which the most gracious day or night of the whole year is. There is a lot of difference on this point, but Ibn al-Qayyim has given his decision in "*Dhād ul-ma'ād* that the ten days of Dhil Ḥajjah are the most gracious, as in these days, occurs the '*sayyid al-ayyām*' (the leader of days, the day of '*Arafah*.) Likewise, among the nights, the last ten nights of the month of Ramaḍān are most gracious since, in these nights, occurs the leader of the nights *sayyid al-layālī Laylatul Qadr* (Night of Destiny). During this excellent night, are transferred from the "*Lauḥ-i-Maḥfūẓ*" (the Tablet of Eternity) important and firm decisions regarding the affairs of the people and things to the angels for execution. The Holy Qur'ān began to be revealed to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) from the '*Lauḥ-i-Maḥfūẓ*' on this very night. To do pious deeds in this night is like performing them through thousand months or even more. (In the commentary of the verse of *Sūrah ad-Dukhān*) "انا انزلناه فى ليلة مباركة" some commentators have said that it is the night of fifteenth of Sha'bān that the Qur'ān was revealed. This can be reconciled with the fact that the beginning of revelation occurred on the night of the 15th of Sha'bān but it ended on *Shabi Qadr* (the Night of Destiny).

CHAPTER XXXIV

ZAKĀT (POOR-DUE) IS A PART OF ISLAM

And the saying of Allāh, the Most Exalted: "And they were ordered naught else than to worship Allāh, keeping religion pure for Him, as men by nature upright, and to establish worship and to pay *Zakāt* (poor-due). And that is the right religion". (Qur'ān, 98:5)

بَابٌ 34 اَلزَّكٰوةُ مِنَ الْإِسْلَامِ

وَقَوْلُهٗ تَعَالٰى وَمَا أُمِرُوْا إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوا اللهَ مُخْلِصِيْنَ لَهُ الدِّيْنَ حُنَفَاءَ وَيُقِيْمُوا الصَّلٰوةَ وَيُؤْتُوا الزَّكٰوةَ وَذٰلِكَ دِيْنُ الْقَيِّمَةِ ؁

44. We have been told by Ismā'il who said that he was informed by Mālik bin Anas, via his uncle Abū Suhayl bin Mālik, that his father (Mālik bin 'Āmir) heard :

✶ Ṭalḥah bin 'Ubaydullāh says:

"A man of Najd with scattered hair came to the Messenger of Allāh. His loud voice was heard but what he said could not be followed. When he came near we knew that he was enquiring about Islam. The Messenger of Allāh said: "You must offer prayers five times a day (during day and night)". He asked: "Is there anything else than Prayers". He replied, "No, but if you do it of your own accord, (you may do it)." Then Allāh's Apostle said, "Fast during the month of Ramaḍān." The man enquired "Is there any fast else than (the ordered) Fast?" He replied, "No, but if you do good of your own accord (you may do it)." Then the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said "Pay *Zakāt* (poor-due)". The man asked. "Is there anything else than *Zakāt*" He replied, "No, but if you do charity of your own accord (you may do it)" Then the man went back saying "By Allāh, I will neither do more nor less than this." The Holy Prophet said, "He will succeed if he is true to his words (i.e. He will go to Paradise) "

44۔ حَدَّثَنَا إِسْمٰعِيلُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي مَالِكُ بْنُ
أَنَسٍ عَنْ عَمِّهِ أَبِي سُهَيْلِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ أَنَّهُ
سَمِعَ طَلْحَةَ بْنَ عُبَيْدِ اللّٰهِ يَقُولُ جَاءَ رَجُلٌ إِلَى
رَسُولِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مِنْ أَهْلِ نَجْدٍ
ثَائِرُ الرَّأْسِ نَسْمَعُ دَوِيَّ صَوْتِهِ وَلَا نَفْقَهُ مَا يَقُولُ
حَتّٰى دَنَا فَإِذَا هُوَ يَسْأَلُ عَنِ الْإِسْلَامِ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ
اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ خَمْسُ صَلَوَاتٍ فِي الْيَوْمِ
وَاللَّيْلَةِ فَقَالَ هَلْ عَلَيَّ غَيْرُهَا قَالَ لَا إِلَّا أَنْ
تَطَوَّعَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَصِيَامُ
رَمَضَانَ قَالَ هَلْ عَلَيَّ غَيْرُهُ قَالَ لَا إِلَّا أَنْ تَطَوَّعَ
قَالَ وَذَكَرَ لَهُ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
الزَّكٰوةَ قَالَ هَلْ عَلَيَّ غَيْرُهَا قَالَ لَا إِلَّا أَنْ تَطَوَّعَ
قَالَ فَأَدْبَرَ الرَّجُلُ وَهُوَ يَقُولُ وَاللّٰهِ لَا أَزِيدُ عَلٰى
هٰذَا وَلَا أَنْقُصُ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ أَفْلَحَ إِنْ صَدَقَ ؎

The meaning and relevancy (of the quotations)

Imām Bukhārī discusses here the significance of deed in connection with the waxing and waning of faith. Prior to this, he mentioned those deeds which had connection with the body. Now he is discussing those deeds concerning wealth and property. Although the verse quoted by the Imām, for supporting his viewpoint, contains reference both to the prayers and the Poor-Due, yet he has confined his discussion here to the Poor-Due. The reason for this is that he has elucidated on different occasions the matter pertaining to other parts of the verse. A true religion is that which contains worship, performance of prayer, obligatory prayers and payment of Poor-Due. Since Poor-Due is included in the *Dīn-i-Mustaqīm* (perfect religion), it is therefore obvious that the Poor-Due is included in Islam. This refutes the doctrine of the Murjites who do not attach any importance to deed. Further, the question about deed, being part of faith, is also clarified. As deed is part of Islam, it would necessarily become part of the faith. This is so, because here the inseparable connection between faith and Islam becomes evident. The meaning of "وما امروا الا ليعبدوا الله مخلصين له الدين حنفاء" is that they should shun all kinds of wrong and falsehood and should devote themselves exclusively to the prayer of One God. Like Prophet Abraham, they should sever themselves spiritually from everything around, and confine themselves to the service and devotion of One Lord. Likewise, they should not consider any one else as an independent Creator and Law-giver of the world. The servant should constantly keep himself in obedience to his Lord. The Lord may or may not bestow His bounties on him and assign paradise to him but the servant should not abjure obedience. This should be irrespective of reward and prayer. If he prays and is obedient to God in order that he may obtain nearness to God and get a place in paradise, then this is an average kind of prayer. If on the other hand, the object of prayer and obedience to God is meant for the attainment of worldly gains, since God is our benefactor and our worldly needs and wants are dependent on Him, then such an attitude is the lowest form of prayer.

A person from Najd came to جَاءَ رَجُلٌ إِلَى رَسُولِ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مِنْ أَهْلِ نَجْدٍ the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Najd is the elevated portion of central 'Arabia, which goes upto 'Irāq. The low lying part on the west coast is called "Tihāmah" and the central part of 'Arabia is called the 'Ḥijāz'. Who was this man from Najd?. In this connection there are conflicting views of scholars. In the opinion of Ibn 'Abd-al-barr,' Ibn Baṭṭāl, 'Iyāḍ, Ibn al-'Arabī and Mundhirī, this man was Ḍimām Bin Tha'labah who belonged to the family of Sa'd Bin Bakr. Muslim, in his collection of Traditions, has narrated the event of Ḍimām Bin Tha'labah immediately after this Tradition of Ṭalḥah. In the opinion of these writers, Ḍimām bin Tha'labah was identified favourably with this unknown person. In both of them was visible the pride of the Bedouin and, at the end, both are reported to have said: "I do not add anything nor reduce anything from this". 'Allāmah 'Aynī has quoted the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*' "باب القراءة و العرض على المحد ث", for the Tradition reported by Anas, which has raised a doubt in the minds of these persons, whether the person who called on the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and questioned him was really Ḍīmām Bin Tha'labah. Regarding the event, Ḥadrat Anas said: "While we were once sitting in the Mosque, a person came riding on a camel. After fastening the camel in the Mosque, he asked, "Who is Muḥammad amongst you?" Anas Ibn Mālik says that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sitting at that time among the people, reclining on a pillow. We said that the man with handsome face was Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم)". After reporting the entire event, Anas quoted the words of the person as follows :-

"I am the representative of my tribe, and I have been sent by it. My name is Ḍīmām Bin Tha'labah." Thus it appears that the reference in the account of both Ḥadrat Ṭalḥah and Ḥadrat Anas is about the same person. Depending on this assumption, Ḥāfiẓ Badr al-Dīn and Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar have quoted the objections of Qurṭabī. Qurṭabī considers unnecessary the attempt to convert both the stories into one when both the contexts are different. This view is supported by scholars, for the person who has been mentioned in this Tradition who had come to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is not Ḍimām Bin Tha'labah but somebody else. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar and Ḥāfiẓ Badr al-dīn both prefer to keep the two stories separate rather than convert them into one.

In short, the Bedouin came murmuring something and from the distance, it was not possible to understand clearly what he was saying. The reason for murmuring appears to be that, as he was representing his tribe, and realising his responsibility, he was repeating the question to himself so that at the time of conversation there might not be any faltering in representing his tribe adequately in obtaining the answers for the questions.

All of a sudden, he started asking about Islamic فَإِذَا هُوَ يَسْأَلُ عَنِ الْإِسْلَامِ injunctions. He put a question which was not expected of him as his external appearance was poor. But he put such a sensible question as appeared beyond his capacity. To all appearance, he was a simple common Bedouin but he asked a question of the utmost importance, so much so that Ḥaḍrat 'Umar and Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās said they had never seen such an intelligent Bedouin.

The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said in reply that Islam constituted prayers five times during the day and the night. Then the Bedouin asked "Is there anything more incumbent on me besides this?" The Prophet replied: "This much is obligatory but the rest is non-obligatory. There is no restriction regarding this but you may pray as much as you like". Then the Prophet mentioned *zakāt* (Poor-Due). The Bedouin then asked, "Is there anything more incumbent on me?" The Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) replied, "so much is obligatory in *zakāt* but if you like to pay more, there is no limit". Regarding the fast, the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) also mentioned the obligatory fasts and said, "Besides this, if you wish to observe more, it is left to your free will."

The person then walked away saying "I would observe neither more nor less." The Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said that if he had spoken the truth, it would be sufficient for his salvation.

The problem of *Witr* (Prayer)

Imām Shāfi'ī, after quoting this Tradition in the *Kitāb al-um*, "ففرائض الصلوة خمس وما سواها تطوع" wrote that, during the day and the night, five prayers were obligatory and, besides these, *nafl* prayer was non-obligatory. Imām Shāfi'ī himself has not further elaborated it. Thereafter, the Shawāfi' have interpreted it that *Witr* is not *Wājib* (compulsory) and is therefore (*Nafl*) non-obligatory, since the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) has declared all other prayers, besides the five, as non-obligatory and *Witr* is thus included in the non-obligatory ones.

Muḥammad bin Naṣr Marūzī has narrated in the book, entitled "Qiyām al-Layl (Prayer during night) that a person asked Abū Ḥanīfah, "How many Prayers are obligatory?" The Imām replied, "Five". He again asked, "Is *Witr* obligatory or not?" He replied: "It is obligatory". Then the questioner asked, "how many does that make?" He replied, "Five". He asked Abū Ḥanīfah again to enumerate and he replied, "Prayers offered in the Morning, Noon, before sunset, just after sunset, and night." Then he asked: "What is *Witr* then?" He again replied "obligatory." Then the person said "You are not correct in counting". The superiority of Abū Ḥanīfah's system of jurisprudence is evident from this. It is true, the obligatory prayers are five, but the nature of *Witr* is also obligatory since it is associated with and subordinated to the obligatory Prayers.

The usual reply from the Hanafites is that, in the Traditions, later on, mention has also been made about the obligatory nature of *zakāt* (Poor-Due), but there is nothing more besides this, except what you give in charity by way of *Nafl* (non-obligatory) payment. Nevertheless, there is also the charity known as *Fiṭr*. The Hanafites consider it as *Wājib* (necessary) whereas the Shawāfi' consider it as obligatory. Since Shawāfi' consider *Witr* prayer as non-obligatory, they should have also considered charity of *Fiṭr* in the same manner as non-obligatory. On the contrary they call it obligatory. If Shawāfi' say that this Tradition

---

[1] The well-arranged non-obligatory prayer offered by the Prophet (*sallallāho 'aliahi wa sallam*) are two *rak'āt* in the early morning prayer, four *rak'āt* before the obligatory noon prayers, and two *rak'āt* after the obligatory ones, two *rak'āt* after obligatory sunset prayer and two *rak'āt* after the obligatory night prayer. 'Abdur Raḥmān

is prior to the making of charity of *Fiṭr* necessary, then the Hanafites are happy and nothing can stop them from saying that the Tradition may be prior to the declaration of *Witr* as obligatory. If the Shawāfi' declare that charity of *Fiṭr* is included in *zakāt* (Poor-Due), as it is a kind of *zakāt* for the body and the well known idea of *zakāt* is for the property, then this is against the usual convention. We can also say that "*Witr*" prayer is included in the five compulsory prayers, since it is not a separate prayer like that of morning, noon, etc., but it is included in the night (*'Ishā'*) prayers, as Mullā 'Alī Qārī has mentioned in "*al-Mirqāt Sharḥi Mishkāt*." Hence, there is no fixed time for this as its time is included in the night prayer. Therefore, there is no separate call for it. It should be clear to any reasonable person that the "*Witr*" prayer has no separate existence like the five compulsory prayers, but it is included in and is subordinate to the night prayer. In fact, besides "*Witr*", the non-obligatory prayers, arranged and offered by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) along with obligatory ones, are also included in the words of the Tradition in *Khamso Ṣalawāt* (Five prayers). "*Witr*" prayer completes the night prayer as Mullā 'Alī Qārī has pointed out on behalf of the Ḥanafites or it is a completing factor for the five prayers, but as much as non-obligatory prayers, performed by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), complete the five prayers. This has been explained in detail, by Ḥujjat al-Islām Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī in his book entitled "*Maṣābīḥ al-Tarāwīḥ*".

What is the meaning of the saying of the Prophet that there are five prayers during the day and the night? It only means, "for you five prayers are compulsory during the day". This is the injunction in general but it is not sufficient as a basis for action. Nevertheless he must have explained the details by his words and deeds. It is not possible for a newly converted Muslim to understand from the general words of five prayers during the day and the night, as to how the prayers should be performed, as there are some external and internal regulations.

The internal regulations are of two kinds. Some of these are basic and some conditional, such as Qiyām (standing), Rukū' (bending) and Sujūd (prostration). Some regulations and orders are complementary such as *Tasbīḥāt* and *Takbīrāt* (praising and reciting the names of God) etc. Likewise, the external regulations are also of two types. Some are conditional and obligatory such as arranging the rows of worshippers, the non-obligatory prayers before and after obligatory ones and likewise "*Witr*" prayer. Now a knowledge of all these is necessary for the performance of the five prayers. Necessarily, all this must have been told by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

In the narration of Ismā'īl bin Ja'far, it has been generally reported that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had indicated to him all the injunctions pertaining to the prayer. In the following words of the Holy Prophet, all these details are included in a concise form. Hence, "*Witr*" and non-obligatory prayers are all included in this, and in the words "*Illā 'an Taṭawwa'a*" (as far as you like) are included, all the accessories along with "*Nawāfil Maḥaḍah*" such as *Ṣalāt al-Ḍuḥā*, *Tahajjud* etc., (forenoon and late night prayers).

On repeating nafl prayer when not timely performed

A controversy has arisen regarding the Tradition whether it is necessary to repeat *Nawāfil* prayers (non-obligatory) once they have been started and not timely and properly performed. According to the Ḥanafites, their repetition is obligatory and according to the Shawāfi' and others, their repetition except Ḥajj is not necessary. The argument put forward by the Shawāfi' is that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) after describing the obligatory prayers, said: "There are no other obligatory ones, if you so please, you can perform non-obligatory prayers (*Nafl*). Hence in *Illā an Taṭawwa'a* (that is optional prayers) exceptions have been taken out. This means that whatever has been cancelled from the bulk, stands separate from the bulk, and the bulk represented the order of the obligatory prayers and the cancelled part represented the non-obligatory ones.

Shawafi' on repetition of "*Nafl*" not being necessary

The Shawāfi' in order to prove this exception as total exception, have quoted a narration from '*Kitāb al-Ṣawm*, of Nisā'ī on Fasting.

The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) some time intended to observe a non-obligatory fast but then broke it.	اَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ كَانَ اَحْيَانًا يَنْوِىْ صَوْمَ التَّطَوُّعِ ثُمَّ يُفْطِرُ

Further they also quote a narration from Imām Bukhārī that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) asked Juwayriah Bint Ḥārith to start a non-obligatory fast on Friday and later on asked her to break it. From these two incidents, can be concluded that there was mention of breaking the fast but no mention of repeating it. It is, therefore, evident that if a non-obligatory fast is imperfectly observed or broken, it is not binding on the person observing it to repeat it. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has cited this narration of Nisā'ī and the incident of Juwayriah Bint Ḥārith in support of the Shawāfi' theory. He says that this statement supports the view that if a non-obligatory (*Nafl*) prayer has been started, there is no need to complete the same. Other non-obligatory prayers will be considered in the same light. The Shawāfi' and their followers are not in favour of repeating the performance of non-obligatory prayers if incompletely performed except the *Ḥajj*. Thus they believe that if the *Ḥajj* is incompletety performed, it is void and it should be performed again. This stand of the Shawāfi' is disputed on the ground that if the *Ḥajj* performed on a non-obligatory basis becomes void, it should be performed again. If it is so, then why other non-obligatory prayers are not likewise treated, when they are begun but not completed. In dealing with this objection, Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar has made out a difference between the *Ḥajj* performed in a non-obligatory manner and other non-obligatory prayers.

Hanafites on the necessity of performing non-obligatory Prayers again

Ḥāfiẓ Badr al-Dīn has expressed surprise in his book entitled '*Umdat al-qārī Sharḥ-i-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* that although Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar in his *Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ-i-Bukhārī* narrated this Tradition in consonance with his views yet he did not cite those Traditions which had pointed out that the performance of non-obligatory prayer once started was to be compulsorily finished and, if performed incompletely, its re-performance was necessary. Hence Imām Aḥmad in his Musnad has cited a Tradition from Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah that, once, when Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah and Ḥaḍrat Ḥafṣah had observed a non-obligatory fast, some cooked mutton was received by way of present. Both of them ate a little of it. When the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came, they told him about it. Thereupon, he asked them to observe fast in place of this broken one some other day, later on. This order of the Prophet to fast again was of obligatory nature. Dār Quṭnī reported about Ummi Salmah that once she observed a non-obligatory fast and broke it. Therefore the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ordered her to observe a fast some other day in place of this.

The narrations of Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah and Ḥaḍrat Ummi Salmah support the view of the Hanafites since there is clear injunction for repetition of the fast in case of premature breaking of the same. It is evident from these arguments that in the words, (as far as you can do), "the exception" which should be of the same type is effectively linked with the original fast. Now the above quoted sentence of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) means that it is left wholly to the performer to start the observance of non-obligatory prayers, but once they have been started, their completion was binding, they cannot be left incomplete. Any invalidity or incompleteness in their performance will necessitate their repetition.

The Hanafites have also argued in the light of this verse of the Qur'ān "لاتبطلوا اعمالكم" i.e. "do not render your action null and void". *Lā tubṭilū* is negative in spirit and constitutes prohibition. When a certain action considered null and void results in prohibition (Ḥarām), then that action should have a necessary position. According to the *Ijmā'* (concensus of opinion), too, the point of view of the Hanafites is justified since there is a unanimous agreement that the performance of a non-obligatory *Ḥajj* becomes obligatory in case of a previous incomplete performance. The Hanafites hold this view on the basis of the concensus of opinion that when the performance of non-obligatory *Ḥajj* begins and its completion becomes obligatory, so in case of other non-obligatory prayers too their completion should be likewise, done, if the lack of something makes it invalid. The writer of *Badāi'* has said that fulfilment of pledges is compulsory whether made verbal or by deed. In the Holy Qur'ān it is said: "Fulfil your pledge". By carrying out the obligation, it is meant here that whatever a person has pledged to perform in order that his wishes be granted, he should perform the same.

The verbal pledge is well-known but the pledge by deed is to start the non-obligatory prayers and after their start it becomes pledge by deed. Thus it is incumbent to fulfil the pledge. And in case this pledge, translated in action becomes invalid, due to one reason or the other, its performance again would be binding. Not only the Hanafites but also the Malikites have presented such point of view in interpreting the word *Illā An Taṭawwa'a* (as far as you can). According to Imām Mālik, re-performance of a non-obligatory act of prayer is binding in case a defect appears in its performance, once it has been started.

Preference of the arguments of the Hanafites

The Tradition quoted by Nisā'ī does not lead to the conclusion that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), after breaking a non-obligatory fast, observed it again. Further his breaking of the fast of this nature was based on some unavoidable circumstance. The incident that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) permitted Juwayriah Bint Ḥārith to break her fast was due to a feast on Friday. From various narrations of this kind, it is clear that permission to break the fast was given but in none of them there is any mention that the fast was not repeated. The absence of mention does not mean that the event did not take place. All similar Traditions, will be dealt with, accordingly.

And if the different versions are accepted, then the interpretation given by the Hanafites will have preference as the Tradition quoted by Shawāfi' is negative while those cited by the Hanafites are positive. And the positive has always preference over the negative. The other thing is that in the view of the Hanafites, caution and care have been exercised in matters of prayer. If the observance of prayer has been incomplete due to some religious or natural causes, then re-performance becomes obligatory by way of atonement. (*Fatḥul Mulhim* vol. 1, p. 115)

Some difficulties

In this connection a difficulty arises in the words of the person who asked the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "Is there anything obligatory on me besides this? "And the word "على" indicates those actions, the performance of which, was made obligatory by God on the man. But the non-obligatory prayer *Nafl* is performed by a person of his own accord. Hence the exception is not mentioned here.

The solution of this difficulty lies in the fact that the starting of a non-obligatory prayer depends on the free will of the person but, once it has started, its completion is made compulsory by the law of religion. Further, with the Hanafites a negation does not bring about the positive aspect of the problem but it constitutes silence over it. So it cannot be called either negative or positive.

If the Hanafites base their arguments on the words "*Lā illā an Taṭawwa*'" (as far as you can) then this objection can be valid against them. But, as already mentioned, their arguments are based on the Holy Qur'ān and the concensus of opinion and they interpreted this Tradition according to the Qur'ān and the *Ijmā*'.

In my opinion the Hanafite view is supported by valid arguments, It is, however, evident that the exception has been separated as, in regard to the *zakāt* (poor-due) also, the words *Illā an Taṭawwa*' occur. To apply the rule of exception, there is difficulty as the poor-due and charity are not like acts of long lasting prayer of which it could be said that once begun, like the obligatory prayer, they should be completed. Thus some writers, simply by way of academic discussion, have tried to apply this principle to *zakāt* (Poor-due) and charity as well that the optional charity, once started, and kept on, and not completed, was regarded as complete. The principle involved in the optional charity is that, it is left to the free will of the individual, at the time of starting it to give or not to give, but once he has given it away, he has no right to revoke or withdraw it. This is also the Ḥanafite view.

Negligence in performing acts according to tradition

Some people present this Tradition in support of their view that only the performance of the obligatory acts is sufficient for well-being as the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), according to this Tradition, deemed five things enough. Perhaps they are not aware that acts according to *sunnat*, and obligatory observances are proved by the injunctions and acts of the Holy Prophet himself (صلى الله عليه وسلم). In this connection it is necessary to see his words to impress upon the people, the need to perform them. Further, the attitude and action of the Companions of the Prophet in this regard have also to be seen. When the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ordered a certain line of action and warned against its renouncement, both Ibn Hammām and Ibn Najīm consider it compulsory. If such an act performed by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) on a permanent basis is, however, missed by him a number of times, then it has to be classified as a Tradition. When the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) pronounced the words "*Illā an Taṭawwa'a*", it was not possible to consider it, at that time, as obligatory or as a Tradition, because the separation between what was obligatory and what was according to the Tradition was done after the time of the Prophet according to the nature of his actions.

Regarding renouncing the Tradition, Ibn Hammām is of the opinion that one who renounces it, will be seriously reproached. In the opinion of Ibn Najīm, he will be punished. Here it appears to be the difference in interpretation but both are unanimous about committal of sin as a result of renouncing the Tradition. Nevertheless, negligence and inattention towards performing acts according to the Tradition cannot be deduced from this Tradition.

وَاللهِ لَا أَزِيدُ عَلَى هٰذَا وَلَا أَنْقُصُ

"By God I will neither exceed this nor do any thing less."

Apparently, it means that he will not perform the non-obligatory prayers and will reduce nothing from the obligatory ones. On this, an objection has been raised that this person took a vow not to carry out the injunctions in performing non-obligatory prayers contained in the Tradition and associated with the obligatory prayers and the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not object to it, although action, according to Traditions, has been emphasised. Earlier explanation has already been given under the words "*Lā illā an Taṭaw-wa'a*," that the vow of the person was not in respect of non-performance of certain prayers according to Traditions since they are included like the "*Witr*" prayer in the obligatories. Thus the conclusion would be that he would perform the compulsory duties along with their adjuncts and no more. The problem is, therefore, resolved.

The other objection is that the additional non-obligatory prayer is also included in good deeds. And to make a statement by swearing on the non-performance of a good deed is forbidden. One answer is that it is forbidden when the renouncing of a good deed is prompted by dislike, or disregard of the Tradition. If it is due to the want of time or preoccupation then it is not forbidden. In this connection, an incident about Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Gangohī and his teacher Shaykh Ḥājī Imdādullāh is related that he had excused himself for not reciting twelve hundred times the name of God due to want of time.

People have given different interpretations of "لا ازيد ولا انقص". Since the person was representing his community, some have understood the meaning of his words in this way that he would deliver the message of the Prophet in full to his community after his return and that he would neither add to nor subtract any word from it. Others have interpreted this to mean that he would observe the forms and the manner of the prayer indicated by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and that he would neither add to nor reduce from it. For example, in the noon prayer he would perform four "*raka'āt*", and not five or three, yet others have given another meaning to it that he would not raise any more question and that he would not reduce the prayers at the time of performance. However, one may add that this attitude had a deeper indication for extreme obedience and devotion. Some still say that the words in acceptance and affirmation of the message were uttered by way of exaggeration, and they may have no (reference) to actual action but only to his conviction. Further they may mean that he would act upon the obligatory part of religion as it is, and would not observe any laxity in its performance. But, at the same time, he would not raise the non-obligatory character of the prayer to the position of the obligatory one by his deeds in such a manner as would make the non-obligatory prayer resemble obligation. However, all these interpretations are possible in the words of the narrations. But another narration from Imām Bukhārī contains the following:

"I will not perform non-obligatory prayers and will not reduce what God has made compulsory for me".

وَالَّذِیْ اَکْرَمَكَ لَا اَتَطَوَّعُ وَلَا اَنْقُصُ
مِمَّا فَرَضَ اللّٰہُ عَلَیَّ شَیْئًا (بخاری باب وجوب صوم رمضان)

To these words, it is difficult to apply these interpretations except that this narration is considered as a narration not reported according to exact words but according to meaning, which have already been cited before and only in one narration these words appear, otherwise the whole matter is the same.

An interpretation by Shaykh al-Hind

If the object is to interpret the whole thing, then the best interpretation is which Shaykh al-Hind has given, i.e., at times, it is intended to deny a thing, but, simultaneously, its opposite is also denied. This is only done to make the speech more attractive or to emphasise or to exaggerate. For example, a seller at the time of selling something, gives out a price. Thereupon, the purchaser in negotiating the price inquires if something more or less is possible in the price. Naturally, here, the intention of the buyer is to lessen the price and not to increase it. Similarly, the seller replies that there would be nothing more or less. In the same manner, the buyer, at the time of weighing a thing, asks the seller to weigh properly and to see that there should not be anything more or less. Here also it is intended to eliminate the less. However, if something more is given, the buyer will not refuse. In the same way, here the words, "*Walā Anquṣu*" indicate the intention not to reduce. The negation regarding the excess is only to make the speech more attractive, or to emphasise "*Lā Anquṣu*", i.e., he would perform it in full and would not reduce it even by a particle. Here attention is invited to the following verse of the Qur'ān:

When its term cometh, they cannot put it off an hour not yet advance (it).
Qur'ān (7:34)

اِذَا جَآءَ اَجَلُهُمْ لَا يَسْتَاْخِرُوْنَ سَاعَةً
وَّلَا يَسْتَقْدِمُوْنَ- (اعراف، آیت ۲۳)

Here occurs a well-known difficulty that when death comes, "putting it off" is reasonably possible. So its negation is right and correct. But its occurrence in advance, is not reasonably possible and there is no purpose served by its negation because it cannot be visualised rationally.

On differences and conflicts in narrations

Sometimes differences and even conflicting ideas occur in *Ḥadīth*. In order to remove these differences and to arrive at the true meaning of the words of the Holy Prophet, it is necessary to go carefully through the evidences and circumstances of the situation so that it may become clear as to what the intention of the Prophet was, on the one hand, and on the other, what the report of the narrator was, explaining a certain event in his own words. For instance, a certain event has been described by a number of narrators and most of the reports agree to it. If, however, a narrator introduces such words in his report as to change the significance of the whole event, then such words and their connotation could be easily detected. In this ***Ḥadīth*** there is the room for *Lā atatawwa'u* in the place of *Lā Azīdu* because *Taṭawwa'a* is superfluously used. However, if it is taken for granted that the person concerned had used the words "لا اتطوع ولا انقص" in his conversation in their literal meaning, it would be absolutely identical to him. But that cannot be the basis of the constitution of any law or regulation. If the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), by his discretionary power, and as a special case, has allowed such privilege to any person, and saying "افلح ان صدق" has accepted his expression *Lā atatawwa'u* it would not be a justification for any person to make it the basis to escape any regulation or law. A number of incidents can be quoted in support of this concession. For instance, after the prayers of 'Īd al-Aḍḥā the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) announced in connection with animal sacrifice, that if a person had sacrificed the animal prior to the 'Īd-prayer, the ritual was not in order and it would be just meant for eating. At this, Abū Bardah bin Nayār stood up and submitted: "My neighbours are poor and cannot offer sacrifice. I sacrificed the animal prior to the prayer so that they may partake of the meat. I had two goats, the one which I sacrificed was mature but the other one, though fat, was not of the age required for sacrifice." Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) allowing Abū Bardah for sacrificing an animal less than one year old said: "After you, no one else will be permitted to do so." Similarly, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ordered a Bedouin who had broken his Ramaḍān Fast by having intercourse with his wife, to free one slave or to observe sixty fasts, or to feed sixty poor persons. But the person pleaded at every stage his inability. In the meantime, some dates were presented to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) who handed over to the man those dates and said "give this in charity". Again, the man said that, in the whole of Madīnah, there was no body poorer than himself. Then the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said to him to use the same, but emphasised that it would not be permissible to any body else.

No exemption from obligatory prayers

From the above facts, it is clear that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had exempted certain persons as a special case but from this it should not be concluded that he had exempted people, in general, from the performance of obligatory prayers, etc. Jalāl-ud-dīn Sayūṭī, in the book entitled, *Mirqāt Al-Ṣa'ūd*, under the narration of Abū Dā'ūd has discussed that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) under his special powers had exempted (a certain person) from performing three obligatory prayers; 'Allāmah Sayūṭī has misrepresented exemptions given by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). In the chapter "المحافظة على الصلوة" in Abū Dā'ūd, there is a narration that 'Abdullāh Bin Faḍālah narrated from his father that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had instructed him on religious matters and asked him to observe five prayers. He submitted to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that he was much pre-occupied during the time of prayers and requested him to tell him a precise general method which, if observed, would be sufficient. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, 'You should be particular in observing morning and evening prayers'. The reason for emphasising the performance of morning and '*Aṣr* prayers is that both these prayers were made compulsory prior to the night of "Mi'rāj" (Ascension), when commandments for the other three compulsory prayers were received. This made the total five. 'Allāmah Sayyed Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī says that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) had instructed the person to observe something more to be recited than the five prayers. Now the man pleaded about want of time; so the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) instructed him to recite those things with the morning and evening prayers. Hence the question of exception does not arise regarding the five prayers, but it was regarding the extra recitation.

However, if it is admitted that the person had spoken to the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) about his pre-occupation in relation to the five obligatory prayers, even then the words of the Prophet were spoken about the five prayers because the observance of the morning and evening prayers opened the way to the observance of the remaining three prayers. Dawn is the time when one feels sleepy and the afternoon prayer is the time of business in the market, etc. Therefore, anybody who observes strictly the dawn and the afternoon prayers will feel it easy to observe the remaining three prayers.

Thus the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) did not exempt anybody from observing prayers. He could emphasise the observance of the five prayers for the welfare of an individual but it was difficult to justify exemption from the obligatory prayers. In conclusion, it may be said that in following the Tradition of 'Abdullāh bin Faḍālah, Sayūṭī's view regarding exemption from obligatory prayer is not correct.

The Prophet said "If he had spoken the truth he was saved." At another place in Bukhārī, in Muslim and Abū Dā'ūd, the words are, "By his father, if he had spoken the truth, he succeeded or entered paradise." A question arises here that there was a swearing by a person other than God, which is forbidden. Writers have explained it in different ways. One explanation is that this is prior to the prohibition. Others have said that the prohibition is for the entire people but the exception is for the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم). Zarqānī has, however, explained it in a different manner. He said that the wisdom underlying the prohibition of swearing by any object other than Allāh is that such an object should not be associated and put at par with Allāh in terms of honour and devotion. Since such an attitude and belief are not possible in respect of the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم), the prohibition does not apply to him. The best explanation is given by a Hanafite scholar Ḥasan Chalpī, "Chalpī" means Mawlānā in Turkish language. He wrote foot-notes on Muṭawwal. There is another one Akhī Chalpī who wrote foot-notes on Sharḥi Waqāyah. He has come after Ḥasan Chalpī. He says that swearing may or may not mean taking an oath according to *Sharī'ah*, and it is only done to emphasise a point of view. Hence the words of Wallāh, Billāh, Tallāh, were used by the 'Arabs for this purpose. They do not mean any formal oath according to *Sharī'ah*.

Consequently a poet addresses his beloved in these words :

اتنا ھوں تیری تیغ کا شرمندہ احسان   سر میرا تیرے سر کی قسم اٹھ نہیں سکتا

I am so much indebted to you for the sword with which you
killed me that by your head, I cannot raise up my head.

"By your God", instead of "By your head" could be a perfect rythm, but it is only for a man of decent taste to appreciate the difference between the two expressions in respect of grace and poetic excellence.

CHAPTER XXXV
TO ACCOMPANY THE *JANĀZAH* (FUNERAL PROCESSION) IS A PART OF *IMĀN* (FAITH)

45. We have been told by Aḥmad bin 'Abdullāh bin 'Alī al-Manjūfī who said that he was informed by Rauḥ that 'Auf had said to him, via Ḥasan and Muḥammad, that:

✱ Abū Hurayrah heard :

The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say :

Whosoever accompanies the *Janāzah* (funeral procession) of a Muslim sincerely and hopes to get rewards from Allāh and remains there till the funeral prayers are said and burial ceremonies are finished, will return with a reward of two Qīrāṭs (carats) and every Qīrāṭ is like the Uḥud mountain. And whosoever joins funeral prayers and returns (before burial) will return with the reward of one Qīrāṭ (carat).

بَابٌ 35 اِتِّبَاعُ الْجَنَائِزِ مِنَ الْإِيْمَانِ

45۔ حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ الْمَنْجُوفِيُّ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا رَوْحٌ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا عَوْفٌ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ وَمُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ أَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ مَنِ اتَّبَعَ جَنَازَةَ مُسْلِمٍ إِيْمَانًا وَّاحْتِسَابًا وَّكَانَ مَعَهٗ حَتّٰى يُصَلّٰى عَلَيْهَا وَيَفْرُغَ مِنْ دَفْنِهَا فَإِنَّهٗ يَرْجِعُ مِنَ الْأَجْرِ بِقِيْرَاطَيْنِ كُلُّ قِيْرَاطٍ مِثْلُ أُحُدٍ وَّمَنْ صَلّٰى عَلَيْهَا ثُمَّ رَجَعَ قَبْلَ أَنْ تُدْفَنَ فَإِنَّهٗ يَرْجِعُ مِنَ الْأَجْرِ بِقِيْرَاطٍ تَابَعَهٗ عُثْمَانُ الْمُؤَذِّنُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا عَوْفٌ عَنْ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ نَحْوَهٗ ؞

Along with Rauḥ, 'Uthmān Mu'adhdhin has narrated this *Ḥadith* as follows :

'We have been told by 'Auf who said that he was informed by Muḥammad bin Sīrīn that he heard Abū Hurayrah say' (as before).

The object of chapter

This chapter is evidently related to the *Kitābul Īmān* (Book of Faith). To accompany a funeral procession is an act considered a part of faith. Hence act is part of faith.

Its connection with the previous chapter is relevant in the manner that the payment of the poor-due and accompanying the funeral have been considered as an act common to faith. The object of poor-due is to enable the poor to live. His needs are fulfilled with the cooperation of others. Similarly, the dead person is also dependent on others for his burial. On account of this similarity, Imām Bukhārī has put the chapter of "اتباع الجنائز" after the chapter of "الزكوة من الاسلام". In the previous chapter, the worldly needs were mentioned and in this chapter the need after death is mentioned. Even as the way-farer on this earth depends for his wants on charity, the traveller to the Hereafter also looks forward to the prayer offered for the benefit of his soul by those remaining behind. God has not permitted irresponsible behaviour towards the poor. Similarly, He has made it obligatory on the Muslims to accord whatever is possible for them to make the journey to the Hereafter comfortable of those who have left. Hence, for doing a little act in this connection has been greatly rewarded.

"Whosoever accompanies the funeral procession مَنِ اتَّبَعَ جَنَازَةَ مُسْلِمٍ of a Muslim." This question has been under discussion between the Ḥanafites and the Shawāfi' how to keep pace with the funeral. Shawāfi' say that people should walk ahead of the funeral. The Ḥanafites prefer to walk behind it. The Shawāfi' view is that those who accompany the funeral are considered to intercede on behalf of the dead who is supposed to be an accused. And, as a general practice, the accused has to follow those who recommend him. On the other hand, the Ḥanafites' view is that the idea to present the dead as an accused before God is not just. Had this been the case, the accused would have been taken in a shabby shroud, whereas, according to religious injunction, the dead body should be properly bathed, cleanly shrouded, perfumed and escorted respectfully. Further, at the time of the funeral prayer, the bier is placed in front. According to the Ḥanafites, it is better, to keep the bier in front. This is according to the meaning of the word "Ittibā‘ (to follow) in the Tradition. Bukhārī has also used the same word "Ittibā‘" in his interpretation as occurs in the Tradition. Dictionary also explains "Ittibā‘," "to follow."

Another question is where the funeral prayer should take place, in or outside the mosque. In the views of the Shawāfi‘ it is better to hold funeral prayer outside the mosque, but there is no harm if it is held inside the mosque. In the Ḥanafite view, it is better to hold it outside the mosque and it is improper to hold it inside.

إِيمَانًا وَاحْتِسَابًا

"With faith in the heart and with the intention to acquire reward", i.e., these two things should be the motive in following a funeral and not the custom or family connections as is generally the case today. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), using the word "Iḥtisāb", (Assessment), drew the attention toward the reward of the act, i.e., if you have the intention of doing good, the reward increases immensely. Hence, he further said: "whosoever accompanied the funeral and after funeral prayer, remained with the dead, upto his burial, would earn two Qīrāṭs of reward. But one who returned before the burial after performing the funeral prayer, would earn only one Qīrāṭ of reward. And not the Qīrāṭ which, according to this worldly measure is one-twelveth of a Dīnār, but the spiritual reward of the Qīrāṭ in the next world, would be as high as the mountain of Uḥud." The intention is to induce the people to perform the act and to emphasize waxing in faith.

تَابَعَهُ عُثْمَانُ الْمُؤَذِّنُ

"This *Ḥadīth* has been supported by 'Uthmān al-Mu'adhdhin," He has narrated this Tradition under his own authority. Its significance is that the Tradition of Abū-Hurayrah as reported by Rauḥ has also been supported by the tradition of 'Uthmān al-Mu'adhdhin. Imām Bukhārī has pointed out the only difference that his own narration is verbatim while that of 'Uthmān al-Mu'adhdhin is in substance.

CHAPTER XXXVI

A Believer must fear lest his good work should go in vain and he does not know it. Ibrāhīm Taymī (who was a preacher) said, "When I compare my words with deeds I fear lest I should be included in the unbelievers." Ibn Abī Mulaykah said: I met thirty Companions of the Holy Prophet, each of them feared that he had become a hypocrite, and none of them claimed that his *Imān* was as perfect as that of Jibra'īl (Gabraiel) or Michael. Ḥasan Baṣrī is reported to have said: A true Believer only fears *Nifāq* (Hypocrisy) and a hypocrite considers himself free from all risks. In this respect, Muslims have been warned against mutual fighting and insistence on sinful acts without making repentance, as Allāh, the Most Exalted, says :—

And will not knowingly repeat (the wrong) they did".

(Qur'ān, 3:135)

بَابُ[36] خَوْفِ الْمُؤْمِنِ مِنْ أَنْ يَحْبَطَ عَمَلُهُ
وَهُوَ لَا يَشْعُرُ وَقَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ التَّيْمِيُّ مَا عَرَضْتُ قَوْلِي
عَلَى عَمَلِي إِلَّا خَشِيتُ أَنْ أَكُونَ مُكَذِّبًا وَقَالَ ابْنُ
أَبِي مُلَيْكَةَ أَدْرَكْتُ ثَلَاثِينَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى
اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ كُلُّهُمْ يَخَافُ النِّفَاقَ عَلَى نَفْسِهِ
مَا مِنْهُمْ أَحَدٌ يَقُولُ إِنَّهُ عَلَى إِيمَانِ جِبْرِيلَ وَ
مِيكَائِيلَ وَيُذْكَرُ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ مَا خَافَهُ إِلَّا مُؤْمِنٌ
وَلَا أَمِنَهُ إِلَّا مُنَافِقٌ وَمَا يُحْذَرُ مِنَ الْإِصْرَارِ عَلَى
التَّقَاتُلِ وَالْعِصْيَانِ مِنْ غَيْرِ تَوْبَةٍ لِقَوْلِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى
وَلَمْ يُصِرُّوا عَلَى مَا فَعَلُوا وَهُمْ يَعْلَمُونَ ؛

The objective

Two interpretations have been elaborated and discussed in this chapter. The first is that a Muslim should always be vigilant lest his virtuous deeds should be nullified at any time due to his negligence and carelessness. The second one gives an account of those things against which he is cautioned, i.e., feuds and fights among Muslims, and repetition of sins without repentance. Imām Bukhārī has quoted the sayings of Ibrāhīm Taymī and other followers of the Companions in support of the first interpretation. As regards the second, he has quoted two Traditions, and since there was no mention in the Tradition about repetition of sins without repentance, he has cited a verse from the Qur'ān "ولم يصروا على مافعلوا وهم يعلمون" to complete the meaning. Perhaps the underlying idea in the first interpretation is to warn the Muslims against hypocrisy while the second is to guard him against sins. It appears that Imām Bukhārī, after having fully discussed the necessities and completing factors of the faith, is now addressing himself to describe the defects and harm caused to the faith. Prior to this he had discussed those actions which resulted in completing the faith and increasing its brilliance. All this discussion constituted a refutation of the view of the Murjites who did not give any importance to deed in respect of *Īmān*. Further, they thought that mere confirmation by tongue was enough to earn the grace of God for paradise and did not consider sin throughout life as injurious to faith. Imām Bukhārī refuted this view that the repetition of sin without repentance was not in conformity with faith. A true Muslim should always be vigilant about his faith and should adopt ways and means to preserve it. One should see how even the great Muslim philosophers, in the past, exercised care and vigilance about their faith.

خَوْفُ الْمُؤْمِنِ مِنْ أَنْ يَحْبَطَ عَمَلُهُ وَهُوَ لَا يَشْعُرُ

"A Muslim should be vigilant lest his good deeds should be nullified at any time due to his negligence." This Tradition is based on the following verse of the Qur'ān:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَرْفَعُوا أَصْوَاتَكُمْ
فَوْقَ صَوْتِ النَّبِيِّ وَلَا تَجْهَرُوا لَهُ بِالْقَوْلِ
كَجَهْرِ بَعْضِكُمْ لِبَعْضٍ أَنْ تَحْبَطَ أَعْمَالُكُمْ وَ
أَنْتُمْ لَا تَشْعُرُونَ (حجرات آیت ۲)

Oh ye who believe! Lift not up your voices above the voice of the Prophet, nor shout when speaking to him as ye shout one to another, lest your works be rendered vain while ye perceive not. (Qur'ān, 49:2)

The significance of this verse is to make people cultured and the cultured, even more cultured. While in the company of the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) it is against etiquette to make noise or to talk loudly or behave in an uncultured manner. It is possible that the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) may be disgusted by your boorish behaviour and all your good deeds may be rendered in vain, and you may not be aware of it. The followers of *Sunnat wal-Jamā'at* unanimously believe that no major sin nullifies good deeds except infidelity. To raise the voice above that of the Prophet or to talk to him in a louder voice would amount to a major sin at the most, but would not constitute infidelity. Whereas, the Holy Qur'ān is explicit in this connection that such behaviour renders good deeds null and void. However, another aspect of the problem is contrary to it that virtues efface the evils and this is according to the verse.

إِنَّ الْحَسَنٰتِ يُذْهِبْنَ السَّيِّاٰتِ ط (ہود، آیت ۱۱۴)،

Lo ! good deeds annul ill deeds.
(Qur'ān, 11:114)

As a rule, good deeds, do awāy with the evil. Now the followers of *Sunnat wal-Jamā'at* hold that excepting infidelity no major sin nullifies good deeds. The Mu'tazilites have opposed the view of the followers of Tradition (*Ahli-Sunnat wal-Jamā'at*). They believe that as sins debar a person from *Īmān*, they make it the basis that the sins nullify faith. Thus Zamakhsharī has argued on this point in the light of the formal meaning of the verse.

A reply to Zamakhshari's argument on destruction of deeds

Many writers have given replies to the arguments put forth by Zamakhsharī. The best reply is that, given in two parts, by Ibn al-Munīr Mālikī.

Firstly: Shouting loudly and making a noise become, sometimes, annoying. As proved by daily observation that if a student raises his voice in the presence of his teacher or a disciple before a spiritual guide or a young person before the elders, it becomes a source of trouble. It is evident that the position of a teacher, a spiritualist and the elders is insignificant compared to that of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

Secondly, the unanimous view of the followers of Tradition is that to hurt the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) amounts to infidelity. The Qur'ān says: "And of them are those who vex the Prophet". (Qur'ān 9:61)

They talk ill of the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) among themselves. Thereafter, a severe punishment was pronounced for the hypocrites for their reproaching, in the Qur'ān: "Those who vex the Messenger of Allāh, for them, there is a painful doom". (Qur'ān, 9:61)

Adding the two parts, we come to the conclusion that raising the voice is of two kinds. In some cases, it reaches the bounds of infidelity when it annoys the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) and it is unanimously agreed that infidelity destroys the good deeds. And in some cases, it is lower than infidelity when it does not annoy the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). Thus raising of voice in all cases does not lead to infidelity and does not efface good deeds as it is not ascertained as to which kind of high pitch is annoying. And even if it is raised to a high pitch, in an insensible way, it is possible that we may consider it as not annoying although it is so and may reach the bounds of infidelity.

Thus the words "لا ترفعوا" correspond to the injunction, absolutely prohibiting in all cases, to raise the voice which would cover the possibility also, when it is done unknowingly.

On account of this doubt as to which pitch of voice is annoying and likely to affect the good deeds adversely the words "وانتم لاتشعرون" were said.

"A person may think that he is doing nothing to annoy the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) while in fact it amounts to annoying him", when it amounts to infidelity and his good deeds would be affected adversely. In conclusion it may be said that in certain cases, the pitch of voice may not be annoying but there is the danger that it may be. So raising the pitch of voices in all cases has been forbidden, in order to avoid the indulgence unknowingly. This is similar to what has been said in another verse of the Qur'ān:

Shun much suspicion; for lo! Some suspicion is a sin. (Qur'ān, 49:12)	اِجْتَنِبُوْا كَثِيْرًا مِّنَ الظَّنِّ اِنَّ بَعْضَ الظَّنِّ اِثْمٌ (حجرات، آیت ۱۲)

Here is the command to escape "much" to cover "some" also (which would be sin).

Thus the verse clarifies everything in this connection and the view of the followers of Tradition is according to the verse, i.e., raising of voice which amounts to annoying the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) constitutes the effects of effacing of good deeds and this is universally accepted as "*kufr*" (infidelity).

In order to substantiate his wrong stand, 'Allāmah Zamakhsharī has quoted a certain verse that all types of raising of voice in his view, lead to infidelity. If this interpretation is accepted, then the excellence of the words "وانتم لاتشعرون" would be lost, for if every raising of voice amounts to destruction of good deeds, then the result is known beforehand. So there will be no meaning in saying "لاتشعرون". Thus according to our interpretation of the verse, the beauty of the words "لاتشعرون" helps to clarify the problems and it is also in keeping with the usage of the language.

Ibn al-Qayyīm, in "*Madārij al-sālikīn*" opposed the view of the followers of Tradition, Ahli-Sunnat wal-Jamā'at and supported the Mutazilites. He wrote with great force that it is not necessary always to refute the Mu'tazilites in everything. If they have their views on any problem in conformity with the Qur'ān and the Traditions, it is no good to oppose them under the cover of interpretation. Thus Ibn Qayyim quoted the following verse in support of the Mu'tazilites' viewpoint:

Render not vain your almsgiving by reproach and injury. (Qur'ān, 2:264)	لَا تُبْطِلُوْا صَدَقٰتِكُمْ بِالْمَنِّ وَالْاَذٰى

The Qur'ān is explicit on the point that reproach and injury render the almsgiving invalid. He also cited a clear Tradition that "Whosoever missed his '*Aṣr* prayer, (afternoon) has lost the merit of his deeds." He has, likewise, quoted in support of his view another Tradition which declares that on the Day of Judgement a person's good and bad deeds would be weighed in the balance and if the virtues were found to exceed the evil deeds, then he would enter paradise; if, vice versa, he would go to hell and his virtues would be nullified.

He has also cited a number of similar Traditions, in addition to quoting the following verse as well: "لاترفعوا اصواتکم فوق صوت النبی الی قولہ ان تحبط اعمالکم وانتم لاتشعرون" "Lift not up your voices above the voice of the Prophet, nor shout when speaking to him as ye shout one to another, lest your works be rendered vain while ye perceive not". Here he has supported the Mu'tazilites. But the standpoint of the followers of Traditions is the same as explained by me earlier.

Reply to the interpretation of Ibn al-Qayyim on the destruction of deeds

The argument based on "لاتبطلوا صدقاتکم", is not correct since the discourse and difference of opinion here concern the point whether any sin by itself can destroy all the good deeds. But in case a good deed is associated with evil, which shows that the good deed was done only in form but lacked the spirit behind it, then the good deed would be destroyed. This is an admitted fact. This verse thus shows that the reproach and injury which are connected with the specific virtue, namely, almsgiving, would destroy it. And this destruction is perfectly justified since the case establishes the fact that the so-called almsgiving was only in form and no true spirit of charity was behind it. Further Ibn Qayyim's view based on the Tradition, "al-Muwazanah" (comparison) does not serve the purpose, for it does not indicate that all good deeds would be lost. At the most, this much may be said in its defence that any excess of sins would naturally eat up the virtues to the harm of the person concerned. This does not necessarily lead to nullifying all the good deeds, which be kept in cold storage for the time being. After he has been purified on serving his term of punishment for his wrong deeds, he would enter paradise according to his good deeds. However, if a person loses all his good deeds there would be hardly any ground justifying his entry into paradise.

Regarding the Tradition "*Ṣalāt al-'Aṣr*", apparently, it seems to support the aforesaid view but the majority regard it as a mere reproach.

Meaning of *Ḥabṭ*

Ḥabṭ, according to the dictionary means serious indigestion as a result of over-eating by an animal who suffers from dysentery and distension of stomach and the bloating of the two sides. This condition of the animal would be called *Ḥabṭ*. Now the animal eats the grass to maintain its health and vigour. Thus, due to indigestion, it would not get the full benefit which otherwise, it would have obtained from its foods. On the other hand, indigestion might some time prove fatal. Even if the animal does not die, it will, in any case, be deprived of the beneficial effect of its food. This is the real meaning of *Ḥabṭ*. Now, by transferred application, *Ḥabṭi 'Amal*, (the loss of good deed) means the loss of the resulting benefits, such as blessings, reward and the pleasure of the Lord, on account of the bar raised by one's own transgressions. It has got two forms. Firstly, on certain occasions, the obstruction is such as to render all the good deeds null and void, as in infidelity (*kufr*). Secondly, the good deeds are not entirely destroyed, but the benefit expected is not available. The latter implies also the sense of *Ḥabṭ*. Likewise, if a person acts in a way that leads to some negative result, the expected benefit will disappear and the whole labour will be lost. Thus, wherever the word *Ḥabṭ* is used in text, as a result of misdeed, the second meaning is applicable. As for example it is said :

Whosoever has not performed '*Aṣr* prayer, his actions have been destroyed.

مَنْ تَرَكَ الْعَصْرَ فَقَدْ حَبِطَ عَمَلُهُ

Here the act of neglecting the '*Aṣr* prayer is such an offence that the person concerned will not obtain the benefit of his action which he should have got. In another narration also, this point has been brought out.

Whosoever has not performed '*Aṣr* prayers, it is like the destruction of his family and his property.

مَنْ فَاتَتْهُ الْعَصْرُ فَكَأَنَّمَا وُتِرَ أَهْلَهُ وَمَالَهُ

Similarly the words "لاترفعوا اصواتكم" mean that the immeasureable benefit, accruing to the Companions of the Prophet on account of his company, would be lost due to a small wrong step and this would be a great misfortune. According to a Tradition the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

said that if a Companion "صحابی" gave in charity half a *Mud*, (a small measure of weight) then this act would far surpass a mountain of gold given away in charity, by any other person. The reason is obvious that the company of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) had infused in the Companions an exceptionally high degree of sincerity, which is the very essence of action. Now, if any body does something contrary to the discipline and dignity of the Company of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), then he would forfeit the blessings and benefits, likely to have accrued. In common parlance, it would mean that all his good acts have been thrown away. It may now be concluded that the word *Ḥabṭ* does not mean total destruction but simply implies the elimination of all the blessings and benefits.

The view of Ibrahim Taymi

Imām Bukhārī, in support of the first view has cited the words of Ibrāhīm Taymī.

"When I compared my ماعرضت قولی علی عملی الا خشیت ان اکون مکذبا words with my deeds, I was afraid to think lest I should be among those who disbelieve." Ibrāhīm Taymī was a God-fearing man who passed his life mostly in prayers and abstained from doing evil. He also urged the people to do good deeds. If the word "مکذبا[1]" is to be treated as an objective case, then it would mean that he was seized by the fear that the people would call him a liar. And if the word 'mukadhdhiban' is taken as a nominative case, and this is usually preferable, then the meaning would be that he feared that he himself might begin to regard himself as a liar. This is like the example given by Imām Ghazzālī. He found a person eating sweets from a vessel, yet, at the same time, he was asking others not to eat it as it contained poison. It is evident that people would call him a liar as he would falsify his statement by his own action.

Although Ḥaḍrat Ibrāhīm Taymī was a God-fearing person, he was ever vigilant. It is because of his fear of God and humility that he said; "I am afraid I may not be termed a liar." Hence it is evident that, in spite of his strong faith, he was always over-cautious. His reference is to the following verse of the Qur'ān:

O ye who believe! why say ye that which ye do not? It is most hateful in the sight of Allāh that ye say that which ye do not. (Qur'ān, 61:2-3)

یایها الذین امنوا لم تقولون ما لا تفعلون
کبر مقتا عند الله ان تقولوا ما لا تفعلون

Preaching obedience to law and then breaking the law results in the wrath of God. Imām Bukhārī has quoted the words of Ibrāhīm Taymī, because he was accused of being a Murjite. In fact, his case is similar to that of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. Thus his view on the Murjites is more effective.

The view of Ibn Abi Mulaykah

Now ادرکت ثلاثین من اصحاب النبی صلی الله علیه وسلم کلهم یخاف النفاق علی نفسه Bukhārī cites the words of Ibn Abī Mulaykah: "I met thirty companions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), every one of them was overwhelmed by the fear of hypocrisy", i.e., every one of them was afraid lest he be accused of being a double-dealer and a hypocrite before God. This rebutted the innovators in religion, Murjites, who did not attach any importance to deed in respect of faith.

---

[1] If *Mukadhdhiban* is read with the short vowel under *dhāl*, this may mean that, "due to some similarity with the hypocrites, in respect of action, I may be included among the hypocrites," since the infidels and the hypocrites are very effective in their talks but in their actions they are nil. Indication of this meaning is given by the translator of the Urdu translation of Bukhārī. *Editor*

In this connection the case of the great Khalīfah 'Umar Fārūq is referred to. He was known as the "Knower of Secrets." He used to ask Ḥaḍrat Ḥudhayfah whether his name was ever included by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) among the hypocrites. Although he was communicated the good news by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that he would enter Paradise, yet he had a constant fear about his faith. Ghazzālī, in his "Iḥyā-'ul-'Ulūm", has quoted the following words of 'Umar: "If there be an announcement from God on the Day of Judgment that all except one person would go not to Hell, then I am afraid, probably, that person would be myself. And further if it is announced that of all men, only one person would enter Paradise, then, I would cherish the hope, by the Grace and Mercy of God that probably, I would be that man."

This is the meaning of the words "الايمان بين الخوف والرجاء" "that faith is between hope and fear." To lose faith in the Mercy of God and to have no fear of the punishment of God, both amounts to infidelity (*kufr*) and results in misfortune. Faith is like a bird whose head is the love of God, the right wing (which is more powerful) is the fear of God and its left wing is the hope in God. The love of God is the most essential thing and hope and fear are both necessary, but fear should have a slight preference over hope, because naturally preventing misfortune is better than seeking some advantage.

مَا مِنْهُمْ أَحَدٌ يَقُولُ إِنَّهُ عَلَى إِيمَانِ جِبْرِيلَ وَمِيكَائِيلَ

None of these Companions of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ever said that his faith was as good as that of the angels Jibrā'il and Mikā'īl. Apparently, this is a taunt against Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, who is said to have declared that "My faith is like that of Jībrā'īl. Behind taunt lies the question that if the Companions of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and other great men in the past did not dare to speak out such a thing and avoided making such tall claims, how could Imām Abū Ḥanīfah make such a claim? We have already explained Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's position in respect of Imām Bukhārī's objection. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah also explained his position by declaring that he had said: "Ka Īmān-i-Jibrā'īl" "Like the faith of Jibrā'īl". The letter ka is used for indicating some similarity[1]. If there is some similarity between two things, it does not mean that the two things likened are equal to each other, as the likeness might rest on one point or another. Nevertheless, to have likeness, does not mean that both the things should be totally equal and identical. However, for a high degree of similarity both should have identical form and content. I do not claim this. We may accept this statement of Abū Ḥanīfah as real or we may reject it. The idea is to exercise caution in such circumstances. This is all the more necessary because, in explaining the identity of the objects of faith, the word "*Mithl*" (like unto) is used. This is evident from the words of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah himself "ان ايماننا مثل ايمان الملائكة" in "*Al 'Ālimo wal Muta'allim*: (the teacher and the student) "Our faith is like those of the angels". In this connection the famous words of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah are "ايمانى كايمان جبرئيل ولااقول مثل ايمان جبرئيل". Another saying is also attributed to him that is "اكره انيقول الرجل ايمانى كايمان جبرئيل ولكن يقول آمنت بماآمنبه جبرئيل" Imām Muḥammad has elucidated this as: "I do not say: like the faith of Jibrā'īl" nor do I say: "Similar to the faith of Jibrā'īl". But I say: "I believe in what Jibrā'īl believes in". Despite the differences in the interpretation, the substance of all the sayings is the same, and that is the common view of faith in God. Abū Ḥanīfah's statement is nothing other than the affirmation of his own faith and that of angel Jibrā'īl, in God, the basis of their faith being the same. If angel Jibrā'īl has faith as a result of his affirmation of various basic facts, Abū Ḥanīfah claimed to have his faith based on those very facts. It is not intended to mean that Abū Ḥanīfah has equality with Jibrā'īl in the quality and intensity of faith. The verse of the Qur'ān itself is a testimony to the identity of basis of Faith.

---

[1] In the *Kitāb al-'Ilm* the matter has been discussed to some extent. 'Abdur Raḥmān

The messenger believeth in that which hath been revealed unto him from his Lord and (so do) the believers. (Qur'ān, 2:285)	اٰمَنَ الرَّسُوْلُ بِمَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْهِ مِنْ رَّبِّهٖ وَالْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ ؕ (بقره، آيت ۲۸۵)

The Holy Qur'ān points out that the basis on which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) believes, is the same as that of the other believers. An important debate took place between Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and Abū Muqātil. It appears from its details recorded in "Al-'Ālim wal Muta'allim" that Abū Ḥanīfah stressed the identity of the basis of this faith. Abū Muqātil asked Abū Ḥanīfah: Is it proper for us to say that our faith is like that of the angels and the Prophets, when we know that the angels and the Prophets are much more obedient to the Command of God than we are?" Imām Abū Ḥanīfah replied: "I have already stated that faith and deeds are two different things. Our faith is like the faith of the Angels and the Prophets. We believe in the oneness of God, and His boundless powers; and we testify whatever is received by us from Him, and the angels and the prophets have done likewise. Hence it is clear that in this respect the Angels and the Prophets and we are all equal." Since these details, clarifying his view, have been given by Imām Abū Ḥanīfah himself, it appears that Imām Bukhārī is not concerned with refuting Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, but with refuting those who indulge in useless criticism.

Hasan Basri's view

In support of "خوف المؤمن من ان يحبط عمله", Imām Bukhārī, after citing the view of Ibn Abī Mulaykah has quoted the words of Ḥasan Baṣrī as follows:

وَيُذْكَرُ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ مَا خَافَهٗ اِلَّا مُؤْمِنٌ وَّلَا اَمِنَهٗ اِلَّا مُنَافِقٌ

"Only he is afraid of hypocrisy who is a true person of faith but a hypocrite is not afraid of it." The position of the faithful is that he is imbued with both hope and fear. As such, he is not fully satisfied with his good deeds, as he is afraid that he might do something which might tantamount to hypocrisy. In the opinion of Ibnuttīn and a group of later scholars, the pronoun, *hu* in the phrase of *Mā khāfahū*, refers to God. This view has been upheld in Nawawī also. In that case, it would mean that he alone will fear God whose faith is perfect, and one who has a wide hiatus between his words and deeds will retain no fear of God in his heart. Although this interpretation is correct and the fear of God is desirable, yet, this meaning is not intended by the writer and is also contrary to the trend of Ḥasan Baṣrī's statement. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has quoted a narration from Hasan Basrī, in "*Fath al-Bārī*", that "والله مامضى مؤمن ولا بقى الا وهو يخاف النفاق وما امنه الا منافق" "By God, there is not a single faithful who is not afraid of hypocrisy, and the hypocrite cares little about hypocrisy." There is also another version from Hasan Basrī where hypocrisy has been analysed.

Thus the meaning of "ماخافه الا مؤمن ولا امنه الا منافق" will also be determined in the light of the detailed narration, and the pronoun occurring in "*Mākhāfahū*" will refer to hypocrisy. Now the meaning will be that he who is afraid of hypocrisy is faithful and he who is not afraid of hypocrisy is a hypocrite. In this way the connection between this chapter and the words of Ibn Abī Mulaykah is also maintained.

"Yudhkar" (used in Hasan Basrī's narration quoted above) is in passive voice, and this is considered as proof of weak testimony although Hasan Basrī's statement here is correct. Hāfiz Ibn Hajar has stated in "Fath al-Bārī Sharh Sahīh al-Bukhārī," a formula from his teacher Shaykh Abul Fadl bin al-Husayn that Imām Bukhārī makes use of passive voice not only where the testimony is weak but also where the substance of a text is given or brevity in describing the text is resorted to. In quoting Ibrāhīm Taymī and Ibn Abī Mulaykah, Imām Bukhārī did not change or summarise the text. So he used the nominative case, but as he reported in brief the substance of the text of Hasan Basrī, he used the passive or "weak voice."

"The description of those things of which the وَمَا يُحَذَّرُ مِنَ الْإِصْرَارِ Muslims are asked to be afraid".

It is a conjunction, connected with "Khawful M'umin" (fear of Muslims) i.e., the other thing which the faithful should shun is the insistence on committing sins. "Without repentance," "من غير توبة" is the interpretation of this insistence. The meaning of insistence on sins is that a person is never inclined towards God and never gives up indulging in sins. A person is thus warned against repetition of sins as this leads to the darkening of his soul, and he faces the danger of even losing his faith. There is also the danger that repetition of sins might lead to infidelity. "Then evil was the consequence to those who dealt in evil". (Qur'ān, 30:10)

Tirmidhī has quoted a narration from Abū Bakr :

مَا أَصَرَّ مَنِ اسْتَغْفَرَ وَإِنْ عَادَ فِي الْيَوْمِ
سَبْعِيْنَ مَرَّةً

He who repents does not insist on repetition of sin, although he may repeat it seventy times a day.

To explain it further, Imām Bukhārī has quoted the following verse:

وَالَّذِيْنَ إِذَا فَعَلُوْا فَاحِشَةً أَوْ ظَلَمُوْا
أَنْفُسَهُمْ ذَكَرُوا اللّٰهَ فَاسْتَغْفَرُوْا لِذُنُوْبِهِمْ
وَمَنْ يَّغْفِرُ الذُّنُوْبَ إِلَّا اللّٰهُ وَلَمْ يُصِرُّوْا عَلٰى
مَا فَعَلُوْا وَهُمْ يَعْلَمُوْنَ ۝ (آل عمران، آیت ۱۳۵)

And those who, when they do an evil thing or wrong themselves, remember Allāh and implore forgiveness for their sins, Who forgiveth sins save Allāh only?—and will not knowingly repeat (the wrong) they did. (Qur'ān, 3:135)

Here the evil means the open shameless acts which affect others also. "Zalamū Anfusahum", points to those actions, the evil effect of which, rests on the person of the doer. In this verse, God has praised those who, by chance, happen to do wrong and who do not repeat them, whether those sins are confined to their person or have effect on others, they implore forgiveness from God. The underlying idea is that those who go on doing evil deeds without imploring forgiveness from God have been condemned in this verse. In another verse of the Qur'ān, too, mention is made about those who persistently repeat sins.

So when they went astray, Allāh sent their hearts astray. (Qur'ān, 61:5)

فَلَمَّا زَاغُوْٓا اَزَاغَ اللّٰهُ قُلُوْبَهُمْ ط (صف، آیت ٥)

It is but natural that by frequently committing evil deeds the heart becomes hard so much so that there is no desire left to do good deeds. Further, the soul of such disobedient evil doers becomes dark and they cease to think of any good. The verse also shows that if a person disobeys a prophet after accepting his Prophethood, his soul becomes dark. Thus a reference is given here of the sons of Isrā'īl who showed obstinacy in not following the injunctions of Prophet Moses and persisted in following the crooked ways. In another verse it is said :

We confound their hearts and their eyes, as they believed not therein at the first. (Qur'ān, 6:111)

وَنُقَلِّبُ اَفْئِدَتَهُمْ وَاَبْصَارَهُمْ كَمَا لَمْ
يُؤْمِنُوْا بِهٖٓ اَوَّلَ مَرَّةٍ (انعام، آیت ١١١)

The natural result of repeating sins will be that God will turn their eyes and their hearts permanently towards the evil just as they were, before accepting the faith.

46. We have been told by Muḥammad bin 'Ar'arah who said that he was informed by Shu'bah, via Zubayd bin Ḥārith, that he (the latter) asked Abū Wā'il about the Murji'ah sect, according to whom, a person does not become *Fāsiq* by committing sins. He said:

✶ 'Abdullāh bin Mas'ūd heard:

The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say: "It is a tremendous sin to abuse a Muslim and it is *kufr* (disbelief) to fight with him".

46۔ حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَرْعَرَةَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا
شُعْبَةُ عَنْ زُبَيْدٍ قَالَ سَاَلْتُ اَبَا وَائِلٍ عَنِ الْمُرْجِئَةِ
فَقَالَ حَدَّثَنِيْ عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ اَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ سِبَابُ الْمُسْلِمِ فُسُوْقٌ وَّقِتَالُهٗ كُفْرٌ ؎

I asked Abū Wā'il about the Murjites. It is سَاَلْتُ اَبَا وَائِلٍ عَنِ الْمُرْجِئَةِ related by Zubayd that he asked Abu Wā'il about the doctrines of the Murjites, as to how far they were correct. In reply he quoted the narration of Ḥaḍrat 'Abdullāh Bin Mas'ūd: "The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said, "To abuse a Muslim is to commit an evil deed." Here it is intended to stress the importance of deeds and to refute the Murjites because according to the Murjites there is no change in the character and quality of faith due to good deeds or commitment of sin after one has accepted the faith. Thus according to them there is no merit accruing out of virtue and no loss is incurred through sins. But according to this Tradition some sins make a man evil doer and lead some one even to infidelity. The Qur'ān says:

And (God) hath made disbelief and lewdness and rebellion hateful unto you. (Qur'ān, 49:7)

وَكَرَّهَ اِلَيْكُمُ الْكُفْرَ وَالْفُسُوْقَ وَالْعِصْيَانَ (حجرات، آیت ٧)

When God has made faith dear to you, He has, likewise, made infidelity, lewdness and sins detestable to you so that you may shun all kinds of indecency. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said in his last sermon on the occasion of his last *Ḥajj* "لاترجعوا بعدى كفارا يضرب بعضكم رقاب بعض" "Do not return to infidelity after me that you may cut each other's throat."

Reply to the Murjites' view

The Murjites are of the opinion that faith is sufficient to obtain salvation. In support of this debased doctrine they make two statements which they think are very effective. They claim that, since worship tainted with infidelity is of no avail, so also evil deeds associated with Faith should cause no harm. Apparently, this statement is paradoxical. In fact, the Murjites have not clearly understood the true meaning of infidelity and faith. The real import of infidelity and faith may be explained by the following example.

Life and death are two opposite facts. In life we find different kinds of diseases and disabilities, which divide it into different categories and grades. A healthy person like a wrestler or boxer is called alive, so also an old man suffering from diseases for a long time, on the verge of death, is also alive but there is an evident difference between the two. The flame of their life is not of the same heat.

And as long as life is present, efforts are made to save it even to the extent of the last breath. And often the efforts are successful. No reasonable person can question the efforts made to remove the diseases as not beneficial. And it is generally accepted that the effort to save life may be successful. But once death comes no remedies, however effective, will be of any avail.[1]

وَإِذَا الْمَنِيَّةُ أَنْشَبَتْ أَظْفَارَهَا أَلْفَيْتُ كُلَّ تَمِيمَةٍ لَا تَنْفَعُ

And when death plunges its claws, then I find all the amulets of no use.

In the Qur'ānic terminology infidelity and faith are styled as death and life. Hence it is said :

Is he who was dead and We have raised him unto life. (Qur'ān, 6:123)

أَوَمَنْ كَانَ مَيْتًا فَأَحْيَيْنٰهُ (انعام، آيت ۱۲۳)

He had died in ignorance and infidelity, then we raised him back to life, inspiring him with faith and true insight. At another occasion God says : "Lo! thou canst not make the dead to hear." (Qur'ān, 27:80)[1]

As it is useless to address a dead person, so also it is of no avail to advise those whose conscience is dead. Now, the view of the Murjites is analogous to the futile claim that as it is useless to try to revive a dead man so no irregularities in life can affect a living person. This contention of Murjites undoubtedly is invalid. However, a dobut arises in this regard because a sentence, similar to the one used by the Murjites, has appeared in an established Tradition, narrated by 'Abdullāh Bin 'Amr Bin Al-'Āṣ, and quoted by Imām Aḥmad from his collection of Traditions (Musnad). This Tradition is against all the generally accepted rules and regulations laid down for assessing Traditions. Hence it is necessary to have recourse to interpretation in respect of total benefit and total loss. The total benefit is to emerge out of Hell, and the total loss would mean the inability to enter paradise. Now the explanation would be that since virtue tainted with infidelity is of no use and, as such, no permanent or total benefit would accrue, no sin can affect *Īmān* adversely. In other words, it would not be possible to escape Hell and totally avoid everlasting punishment. In short, the total loss or damage would mean the everlasting torture in Hell, preventing him from entering Paradise. However, if the punishment in hell is according to the gravity of the crime, the sinner would then be confined to Hell for a limited period.

---

[1] Those whose conscience is dead and who are deaf and blind and who do not even intend to listen to, will not be able to hear or see things under your guidance. Advice and admonition would be beneficial only to those who wish to hear it and act accordingly.

The second dubious view of the Murjites

Another view of the Murjites is that since infidelity does not deserve to enter Paradise for a moment so also faith cannot be confined to Hell for a moment. Now if the sinning believers are sent to Hell, this would necessarily mean that they would go to hell along with their faith. This view of the Murjites has no logical basis for it is not possible to prove a doctrine by means of mere speculations. Nevertheless, a reply has been given by the Ṣūfīs. It is that, at the time of sending a sinning man of faith to Hell, his faith will be separated from him and kept back in the same way as a criminal is sent to the prison divested of his dress which is kept in safe custody and is rendered back to him after the term of his imprisonment is completed. Here, too, after the completion of punishment in Hell, he will be given back his dress of faith and will enter Paradise.

On the Day of Judgement qualities will assume the form of object itself

Regarding the question that faith and belief are additional attributes of life which cannot be separated from it, it is sufficient to say that such a contention is baseless as additional qualities will assume the form of the object itself on the Day of Judgement. A Tradition of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) says that besides this world, there is another world where the abstract and hidden things of life like the qualities and character of men, etc., will take appropriate forms according to their nature. Thus the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said :

Sūrah Al-Baqarah and *Sūrah Al-'Imrān* of the Qur'ān will appear, on the Day of Judgement, in the form of two clouds, or two umbrellas or two flocks of birds which will speak on behalf of their reciters. (*Ḥujjatallāh al-Bālighah*, chapter on the description of *'Ālamul Mithāl*)

إِنَّ الْبَقَرَةَ وَآلَ عِمْرَانَ تَأْتِيَانِ يَوْمَ
الْقِيٰمَةِ كَأَنَّهُمَا غَمَامَتَانِ أَوْ غَيَايَتَانِ أَوْ
فِرْقَانِ مِنْ طَيْرٍ صَوَافَّ تُحَاجَّانِ عَنْ أَهْلِهَا
(حجۃ اللہ البالغہ، باب ذکر عالم المثال)

Regarding the days of the week, the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said :

God will present on the Day of Judgement all the days of the week exactly as they are but He will make Friday appear in full luminosity and grandeur.

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ تَعَالٰى يَبْعَثُ الْأَيَّامَ يَوْمَ الْقِيٰمَةِ
كَهَيْئَتِهَا وَيَبْعَثُ الْجُمُعَةَ زَهْرَآءَ مُنِيْرَةً

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said :

"When calamity descends, the prayer fights it and stops it." ينزل البلاء فيعالجه الدعآء

And he further said : "Death will be slaughtered in the form of a ram between the Paradise and the Hell. ''يؤتىٰ بالموت كانه كبش فيذبح بين الجنة والنار''

There is another Tradition:

He stretched his hand to pluck a bunch of fruits of Paradise but receded on account of the heat of Hell, saying "Oh Oh".

أَنَّهُ بَسَطَ يَدَهُ لِيَتَنَاوَلَ عُنْقُودًا مِّنَ الْجَنَّةِ وَأَنَّهُ تَكَعْكَعَ مِنَ النَّارِ وَنَفَخَ مِنْ حَرِّهَا

Besides, there are many Traditions from which it can be deduced that, over and above this material world, there are several things which do not appear to the common people to have any form or body, but they have form and body according to their attributes and qualities, for example, the actions will be capable of being weighed and the praise of God, etc., will appear in the form of trees. However, there can be no harm in sending to hell a sinner who has faith For instance, gold put in fire does not burn but the impurities burn out and gold comes out pure and lustrous. Similarly, a washerman places the dirty clothes on the furnace. The dirt is removed and the clothes come out clean. Likewise, when a sinner with faith will be put into the Hell, his heart which is the abode of faith will remain intact and no harm will come to it. The heart of a man of faith will remain un-affected like Prophet Abraham who remained safe with his body in the fire. And the Qur'ān says :

(It is) the fire of Allāh kindled, which leapeth up over the hearts (of men).

(Qur'ān, 104:6-7)

نَارُ اللّٰهِ الْمُوْقَدَةُ الَّتِیْ تَطَّلِعُ عَلَی الْاَفْئِدَةِ (ہمزہ، آیت ۶،۷)

It is not possible to describe the character of this fire. It is very discriminating. It peeps into the hearts. It does not affect a person of faith adversely while it burns the infidels. It reaches the heart of the infidel as soon as it touches his body. Yet a sinning man of faith will be confined to Hell for the purpose of purifying and cleaning him. The sinning Muslims are like the dirt on the clothes and the dross in gold. On putting them into fire, the dirt and dross go away and they are purified and become clean. But the analogy of an infidel is that of an absolutely impure and irremovable dirt which, in spite of being fumigated innumerable times, will not become clean, and hence will be confined to fire for ever.

"On abusing a Muslim, a man becomes an evil doer and if he fights a Muslim, he becomes infidel." This refutes the view of the Murjites as they do not consider faith tainted with sins as harmful. It is now clear from this Tradition that there are some sins which make a man evil doer and yet other sins besmear him with infidelity. And Abū Wā'il has cited this Tradition to refute the view of the Murjites. Although it refutes the Murjites, it tends to support the Mutazilites and Khawrijites superficially, because they consider those who commit major sins as infidels, and in this Tradition fighting of a Muslim against another Muslim is explicitly considered as infidelity. Nevertheless, the followers of Tradition do not consider one who commits a major sin as infidel. The whole matter has been explained before in the chapter on "Sins and subjects concerning the period of ignorance." It is true that fighting a Muslim is undoubtedly a constituent of infidelity. But the commitment of a sin does not completely deprive a believing person of his faith as has already been explained in the aforesaid chapter.

سِبَابُ الْمُسْلِمِ فُسُوْقٌ وَّقِتَالُهٗ كُفْرٌ

We ask the Khawrijites and the Mutazilites as to why they do not consider abusing a Muslim as infidelity although it is also a sin.

If they interpret it and explain it, we should also have the right to do the same. Yet the followers of Tradition wish to find out as to why abusing a Muslim is merely considered a "sin" and fighting him as "infidelity" when both are open sins. What is the reason for this difference ? The fact is that according to the rules of rhetorics and eloquence when two similar things are described, but they have apparent difference, then such words are used as would reflect the apparent difference ; otherwise the common people will consider both as identical. Here, fighting a Muslim and abusing a Muslim are two different things.

If after declaring the "abusing of Muslims as sins", the same word i.e. "sin", would have been used for killing a Muslim, the difference in the nature of these two kinds would not have been brought out. Hence "abusing" has been described as sin (*fisq*) and fighting as infidelity (*kufr*), because "infidelity" is a much greater sin than "abusing", and deserved severe condemnation. This is a clear pointer to the difference in the interpretation of "abuse" and "fight".

Qur'anic interpretation by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

The interpretation of abusing a Muslim as sin (*fisq*) conforms to the interpretation of the Holy Qur'ān by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Although the word "abuse" is not used there, yet it clearly means that. The Qur'ān says :

Neither defame one another, nor insult one another by nicknames. Bad is the name of lewdness after faith. (Qur'ān, 49:11)

وَلَا تَلْمِزُوا أَنفُسَكُمْ وَلَا تَنَابَزُوا بِالْأَلْقَابِ
بِئْسَ الِاسْمُ الْفُسُوقُ بَعْدَ الْإِيمَانِ (حجرات، آیت ۱۱)

By giving a bad name to any one, one commits a sin, so much so that it is *ḥarām* (strictly prohibited) to call a person by bad name without reason. But if there is a good reason, for instance, a man is lame and is known by that name, there is no harm in using that name. In the same way one who coins a bad name whether the defect is present or not, he will be called impolite, lewd, sinner and an oppressor. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has interpreted this as "abusing Muslim is a sin."

The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has interpreted "the fighting with a Muslim" as "*kufr*" (infidelity) in conformity with the interpretation of the Qur'ān. The source of this is also present in the Qur'ān, where identical words are used in describing the punishment of a kāfir (infidel) and one who deliberately kills a Muslim. Thus, it is said in the Qur'ān.

Whoso slayeth a believer of set purpose, his reward is Hell for ever. (Qur'ān, 4:93)

وَمَن يَقْتُلْ مُؤْمِنًا مُّتَعَمِّدًا فَجَزَاؤُهُ
جَهَنَّمُ خَالِدًا فِيهَا (نساء، آیت ۹۳)

God has prescribed the punishment for intentionally killing a Muslim as eternal confinement to fire, which is the punishment of a kāfir (Infidel). Hence "Qitāl" of a ***Mu'min*** is mentioned as "kufr" in the ***Ḥadīth***. It is a different matter what is intended by confining to fire in the above ***Āyah***, and it is also a separate issue that religious jurists do not accord the same punishment on earth. The details in this regard may be obtained from books on Islamic Jurisprudence.

47. We have been told by Qutaybah bin Sa'īd who said that he was informed by Ismā'īl bin Ja'far, via Ḥumayd, via Anas, that he (last narrator) said on the authority of:

✱ 'Ubādah bin Sāmit that the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) once went out to inform the people about the Night of Qadr (Decree or Power); Meanwhile two Muslims started fighting. Then he (Apostle) said: "I came here to tell you about the Night of Qadr, (i.e. exact date thereof), but because so and so were fighting. I forgot it, and perhaps it may be good for you. Anyhow, seek this Night on the 27th, 29th and 25th nights.

47۔ حَدَّثَنَا قُتَيْبَةُ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ حَدَّثَنَا إِسْمٰعِيلُ
بْنُ جَعْفَرٍ عَنْ حُمَيْدٍ عَنْ أَنَسٍ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنِي عُبَادَةُ
بْنُ الصَّامِتِ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
خَرَجَ يُخْبِرُ بِلَيْلَةِ الْقَدْرِ فَتَلَاحَى رَجُلَانِ مِنَ
الْمُسْلِمِينَ فَقَالَ إِنِّي خَرَجْتُ لِأُخْبِرَكُمْ بِلَيْلَةِ
الْقَدْرِ وَإِنَّهُ تَلَاحَى فُلَانٌ وَفُلَانٌ فَرُفِعَتْ وَ
عَسَى أَنْ يَكُونَ خَيْرًا لَكُمْ فَالْتَمِسُوهَا فِي السَّبْعِ
وَالتِّسْعِ وَالْخَمْسِ ؞

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) was informed about the exact night in which the Night of Power would occur. He had come out to give the information to the Muslims, when in the Mosque of the Prophet two persons started fighting. One was Ka'b Bin Mālik who was the lender and the other was 'Abdullāh Bin Ābī Ḥadard Aslamī who was the borrower. The fight started between them regarding the money lent. In some narrations it is said that these two persons started exchanging hot words at the top of their voices. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) thereupon asked the lender to write off half of the loan and he immediately complied with the order. He then instructed the debtor to pay off the balance. Thus he tried to quell the quarrel. In the meantime, the matter about the Night of Power escaped his mind. He said:

"I had come out to إِنِّي خَرَجْتُ لِأُخْبِرَكُمْ بِلَيْلَةِ الْقَدْرِ وَإِنَّهُ تَلَاحَى فُلَانٌ وَفُلَانٌ فَرُفِعَتْ tell you about the Night of Power and the two persons started quarrelling. Hence, that has been removed from (my heart)." That is he had come out of his house to tell them as to when the Night of Power fell, but the quarrel between the two persons became the cause of their deprivation, and on account of the evil consequence of this quarrel, the special knowledge of the night was removed from his heart.

Quarrelling with each other is the cause of deprivation

The removing of the knowledge of the Night of Power is included in "*Nunsihā*[1]", (cause to be forgotten), vide Qur'ān 2:106. God in His wisdom decided that the exact night of occurrence of the Night of Power should not be made known. But to make it known for a while and then to take away the knowledge thereof, was meant for warning the people that quarrelling with each other is such an evil and detestable thing that on account of its bad omen, such a happy tiding was taken back. When the heart of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) is affected by the quarrel of others, what will be the fate of the persons who quarrel with each other.?

---

[1] "Such of our revelations as we abrogate or cause to be forgotten, We bring (in place) one better or the like thereof", 2:106. That is, some *Āyah* is abrogated or its knowledge is removed from the mind, This is not because there is some defect in it, but on account of the fact that, at that time, that was proper and now the other commandment is more appropriate.

Hence, animosity is a very detestable thing, and is such an evil that can lead to specific and general punishment. By this, people become deprived of a large number of God's blessings and bounties.

If demanding one's dues leads to an exchange of hot words, then it is not in itself so detestable. But to quarrel in the mosque which is the place of worship is something highly undesirable. And it was all the more despicable when such a fight took place in the holy precinct of the Prophet's Mosque, and during the month of Ramaḍān which is a special period for worship and prayers, and above all, in the very presence of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), particularly when raising the voice in his presence had been strictly forbidden in the following words of the Qur'ān "لاترفعوا اصواتکم فوق صوت النبی الی قوله ان تحبط اعمالکم". Hence in one way this was bad (for the Muslims) but in another it was good as the Prophet himself said: وَعَسٰى اَنْ يَّكُوْنَ خَيْرًا لَّكُمْ "Perhaps there may be some good for you in this". And the good consists in this that people may strive harder and worship more and more. But it goes without saying that due to the evil consequence (of our action) we were deprived of this blessing. Nevertheless, on account of the favour of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) some part of the blessing (in disguise) is still available to us. Had the exact time been made known to us, we would have refrained from trying hard and would have been satisfied with getting up (in the night) at the appointed time for prayer and repentance. Hence we would have been deprived of the persistent search for the Night of Power, which too is in itself a great worship. We would have lacked the genuine desire and since there is a difference between a casual desire and genuine desire, there is, in a way, some benefit and in a way, loss.

Some people take "*Farufi'at*" to mean that the Night of Power has been taken away (removed), and according to them, it is no more in existence. They interpret from this *Ḥadīth* that the Night of Power does not exist (any more). But this argument is like stopping at the words "لاتقربوا الصلوۃ[1]" since immediately after this the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said "*Fal tamisūhā*" i.e., "go on searching it". If the Night of Power no more existed, what is the meaning of *Fal tamisūhā*? The meaning of "***Rufi'at***" is that the knowledge of occurrence of the Night of Power which was given to the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was removed. By it, is meant "Removal of knowledge", "Removal of its exact determination", and not "Removal of its existence". The existence of Night of Power will therefore remain till the Last Day.

The intention of Imām Bukhārī in quoting this *Ḥadīth* is that, as the mutual animosity of the Muslims resulted in the removal of the knowledge of the exact occurrence of the Night of Power, in the same way, the sins result in destruction and negation of good deeds. By this, a sort of connection is established with the theme of the chapter.

The exegetes of Bukhārī say, at this juncture, that Imām Bukhārī has cited two *Aḥādīth* in this chapter. And in the appendix to the chapter, he has given two subsidiary chapters. The first *Ḥadīth* is related to the second chapter "ما یحذر من الاصرار" and the second *Ḥadīth* to the first chapter "خوف المؤمن ان یحبط عمله" in their support". They give the reason for the similarity that usually, in quarrels and in (mutual) animosity, the voices are raised and the fear of the destruction of good deeds is present in the *Āyah* of the Holy Qur'ān: "انتحبط اعمالكم وانتم لاتشعرون". Whatever we have written under this chapter, is the opinion of the Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan, that Imām Bukhārī has cited the words of Ibrāhīm Taymī, Ibn Àbī Mulykah and Ḥasan Baṣrī in support of the first chapter, and in support of the second, he has quoted two *Aḥādīth*. But since in these *Aḥādīth* no mention was made about "Insistence on sin even after repentance", Imām Bukhārī filled this gap by citing "ولم يصروا علىٰ مافعلوا وهم يعلمون", "And did not persist in what they did earlier, although they knew that it was wrong to do so". According to the Shaykh al-Hind both these chapters are proved. Further, by the words of Ibrāhīm Taymī, Ibn Abī Mulykah and Ḥasan Baṣrī, the chapter of "خوف المؤمن انيحبط عمله" is proved, where Muslims are taught to be afraid of hypocrisy. And by "سباب المسلم فسوق وقتاله كفر" and "انه تلاحىٰ فلان وفلان" the explanation of "ما يحذر من الاصرار" is proved, where the Muslims are asked to fear sins. The connection of the second *Ḥadīth* with the explanation is that, as the knowledge imparted can be taken away, so also by repetition of sins and by not giving them up, the actions would become void and useless.

---

[1] There is a famous example of converting an *Ayah* of the Qur'ān in one's favour by mutilation and separation from the context as follows: "do not do prayers (*ṣalāt*)." But the sentence is only completed by "when you are drunk." 'Abdur Raḥmān

The verdict of religious scholars on repetition of sins

The decision of the scholars is that by repeating minor sins, the minor sins do not remain minor. If a man goes on repeating the minor sins, without repenting and asking forgiveness of God, then such minor sins become major. In the same way, by repetition, the major sins do not remain (only) major sins. If a person goes on committing major sins without repentance and asking forgiveness, then those major sins will take him nearer to *kufr* (infidelity).

CHAPTER XXXVII

Enquiry of Jibr'āīl from the Apostle of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) about Īmān, Islam and Iḥsān and the Day ot Resurrection, and the replies given by the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) to him. Then he said to the people: "Jibrā'īl came here to teach you your religion". So the Apostle regarded all this as part of religion and also what the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) had said to the delegation of 'Abdul Qays about *Imān*. Allāh, the Most Exalted, says :—

"And whoso seeketh as religion other than the Surrender (to Allāh) it will not be accepted from him. (Qur'ān, 3:85)

بَابُ 37 سُؤَالِ جِبْرِيْلَ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
عَنِ الْإِيْمَانِ وَالْإِسْلَامِ وَالْإِحْسَانِ وَعِلْمِ السَّاعَةِ
وَبَيَانَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لَهُ ثُمَّ قَالَ
جَآءَ جِبْرِيْلُ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ يُعَلِّمُكُمْ دِيْنَكُمْ فَجَعَلَ
ذٰلِكَ كُلَّهُ دِيْنًا وَّمَا بَيَّنَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
لِوَفْدِ عَبْدِ الْقَيْسِ مِنَ الْإِيْمَانِ وَقَوْلِهٖ تَعَالٰى وَمَنْ
يَّبْتَغِ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِيْنًا فَلَنْ يُّقْبَلَ مِنْهُ

The intention of Imām Bukhārī is to show that Īmān, Islam and Iḥsān (act of obliging) are all one and the same thing. Jibra'īl put the questions to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in proper sequence and the reply was in the same sequence, i.e., *Īmān Islām* and *Iḥsān*. At the end, the Prophet said: "This was Jibra'īl who had come to teach you your religion". In the teaching of Jibra'īl, there were *Īmān*, *Islām* and *Iḥsān*. Hence it is clear that all these constitute religion and for this reason, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) called it *Dīn*. Hence, Imām Bukhārī himself is trying to elucidate his intention by "All these were made religion", that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) gave the name of *Dīn* (religion) to all these. Here, Imām Bukhārī has thus established the chapters. In the first chapter, he is trying to prove that the things that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) enumerated in his reply are the very essence of *Dīn* (religion). By the second chapter, he is trying to explain that *Īmān* and *Islam* are one (identical). He is using as a proof the *Ḥadīth* regarding the delegation of 'Abd al-Qays which will be dealt with, later, under the chapter "أداء الخمس من الايمان". The things that were mentioned to the deputation of 'Abd al-Qays, are the same that he mentioned in reply to the query by Jibra'īl as to what *Islam* is. Hence *Īmān* and *Islam* are one. By the third explanation, Imām Bukhārī wants to prove that *Islam* and *Dīn* are one. For the purpose of proving his contention he is taking support of the *Āyāh* of the Qur'ān, "And whoso seeketh as religion other than the surrender (to Allāh), it will not be accepted from him." This means that *Islam* and *Dīn* are interpretation of one and the same thing. Had there been any difference in these, the searcher of *Islam* would not have been the searcher of *Dīn*. In the last chapter Imām Bukhārī has taken recourse to various interpretations to prove that actions are a part of *Īmān* (faith), and the intention of this was to rebut the Murjites, who do not consider actions necessary for faith. Hence, he has used the words *Īmān*, *Islam* and *Dīn* at different places. Now, he is proving that the source and substance of all is one. By the sum total of the arguments, the intention of Bukhārī is amply evident. But by these arguments of Bukhārī, no harm is done to the doctrine of the Ḥanafites, as in the application and use of words, there is a latitude available to everyone. The discussion is on the essence of faith and *Islam*. But substituting one for the other, in exercise of the usual latitude or interpreting one for the other, is common, and not extraordinary. Undoubtedly, the reality (essence) of every thing is different. *Īmān* is the name of attestation and *Islam* is the name of actions, whether they belong to the parts of the body or the tongue. Hence, the ***Ḥadīth*** of Jibra'īl is a clear proof of this. When Jibra'īl asked the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) about *Īmān* (faith), the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), unaware of the fact that the questioner will, after a while, ask about Islam divulged to him the real meaning of *Īmān*, without reference to what the meaning of *Islam* is. Then, when the question was put about *Islam*, he described the real connotation of Islam. The Ḥanifites should use this *Ḥadīth* itself in proof of their doctrine, since here, both have been described in one place, and here only, the reality of both can be highlighted. If *Īmān* and *Islam* had been identical in meaning, then Jibra'īl would not have made two separate questions. The very fact that he made two separate questions is in itself a proof that *Īmān* and *Islam* are two different things. Imām Bukhārī on seeing only "يعلمكم دينكم" (teaches you your religion) just like "حفظت شيئا وغابت عنك اشياء" "In protecting one thing you have ignored other things" has made the *Ḥadīth* of the Jibra'īl sheet anchor of his arguments, although it proves the standpoint of the Ḥanifites. As far as the *Ḥādīth* of the delegates of 'Abd al-Qays is concerned, the answer is the same as given by Ibn Rajab Ḥanbalī in the following words "اذا اجتمعا تفرقا واذا تفرقا اجتمعا". The meaning of the principle of Ibn Rajab Ḥanbalī is that if the use of the words *Īmān* and *Islam* is made together in one place, there will be no identity in what is proved by them, as is found in the questions made by Jibra'īl. But if the words *Īmān* and *Islam* are not used together, and if only the word *Īmān* or only the word *Islam* is used, then here the use of the other is in the form of expansion (interpretation). This has already been explained in detail in the beginning of the Book on faith and a reference may be made thereto.

48. We have been told by Musaddad who said that he was informed by Ismā'īl bin Ibrāhīm that Abū Ḥayyān al-Taymī had told him, via Abī Zur'ah, that :

✱ Abū Hurayrah narrated:

"The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) was one day sitting among his Companions. A person came to him and enquired: "What is *Imān*?" The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) replied: "*Imān* (Faith) consists in belief in Allāh, His angels, meeting with Him, His Apostles and in the Day of Resurrection." Then he enquired, "What is Islam." He (Allāh's Messenger) replied Islam means that you must worship Allāh and never associate any partner to Him, offer prayer, pay the obligatory *Zakāt* (poor-due) and fast during the month of Ramaḍān. Then he asked, "What is Iḥsān?" The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) replied: Iḥsān means that you worship Allāh devotedly as if you were seeing Him, and if you cannot do that, (you must believe that) He sees you. He asked. "When will the Day of Resurrection come?" He (Prophet) replied, "The answerer does not know it better than the questioner. However, I will relate some signs of it to you. Firstly, when a maid-slave will beget her master. Secondly when poor shepherds of black camels exalt themselves in the construction of palatial buildings. And there are five things which none knows except Allāh". He then read the following verse of the Qur'ān.

"Lo! Allāh! With him is the knowledge of the Hour, He sendeth down the rain, knoweth that which is in the wombs. No soul knoweth what it will earn tomorrow, and no soul knoweth in what land it will die. Allāh is knower, Aware.

48- حَدَّثَنَا مُسَدَّدٌ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا اِسْمٰعِيْلُ بْنُ
اِبْرَاهِيْمَ اَخْبَرَنَا اَبُوْ حَيَّانَ التَّيْمِيُّ عَنْ اَبِيْ زُرْعَةَ
عَنْ اَبِيْ هُرَيْرَةَ قَالَ كَانَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
بَارِزًا يَوْمًا لِلنَّاسِ فَاَتَاهُ رَجُلٌ فَقَالَ مَا الْاِيْمَانُ
قَالَ الْاِيْمَانُ اَنْ تُؤْمِنَ بِاللّٰهِ وَمَلٰٓئِكَتِهٖ وَبِلِقَآئِهٖ
وَرُسُلِهٖ وَتُؤْمِنَ بِالْبَعْثِ قَالَ مَا الْاِسْلَامُ قَالَ
الْاِسْلَامُ اَنْ تَعْبُدَ اللّٰهَ وَلَا تُشْرِكَ بِهٖ وَتُقِيْمَ الصَّلٰوةَ
وَتُؤَدِّيَ الزَّكٰوةَ الْمَفْرُوْضَةَ وَتَصُوْمَ رَمَضَانَ قَالَ
مَا الْاِحْسَانُ قَالَ اَنْ تَعْبُدَ اللّٰهَ كَاَنَّكَ تَرَاهُ فَاِنْ
لَّمْ تَكُنْ تَرَاهُ فَاِنَّهٗ يَرَاكَ قَالَ مَتَى السَّاعَةُ قَالَ
مَا الْمَسْئُوْلُ بِاَعْلَمَ مِنَ السَّائِلِ وَسَاُخْبِرُكَ عَنْ
اَشْرَاطِهَا اِذَا وَلَدَتِ الْاَمَةُ رَبَّهَا وَاِذَا تَطَاوَلَ
رُعَاةُ الْاِبِلِ الْبُهْمُ فِي الْبُنْيَانِ فِيْ خَمْسٍ لَّا يَعْلَمُهُنَّ
اِلَّا اللّٰهُ ثُمَّ تَلَا النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اِنَّ
اللّٰهَ عِنْدَهٗ عِلْمُ السَّاعَةِ الْاٰيَةَ ثُمَّ اَدْبَرَ فَقَالَ
رُدُّوْهُ فَلَمْ يَرَوْا شَيْئًا فَقَالَ هٰذَا جِبْرِيْلُ جَآءَ
يُعَلِّمُ النَّاسَ دِيْنَهُمْ قَالَ اَبُوْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ جَعَلَ ذٰلِكَ
كُلَّهٗ مِنَ الْاِيْمَانِ ۞

Then he went away, and the Apostle asked his companions to call him back, but he was nowhere found. Then the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said "He was Jibrā'īl who came here to teach the people their religion." Abū 'Abdullāh said: "The Apostle of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) considered all these things as parts of *Imān* (Faith)."

This *Ḥadīth* is of great significance. Qurṭabī has said "يصلح ان يقال له ام السنة" i.e., we will be justified in calling this *Ḥadīth* as the essence and sum total of all traditions of the Holy Prophet. Just as the *Sūrah al-Fātiḥah* is the sum total and the essence of the Qur'ān, in the same way, the substance of all *Aḥādīth* and the essence of the twenty three years' life of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is embodied in this *Ḥadīth*. Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ has said that it consists of all the external and internal worship and all such things as are related to *Īmān* (faith) and there is also a description in it of such things as are connected with the actions of the limbs, secret and unostentatious worship and protection against calamities due to evil actions.

To such an extent that all the religious knowledges are concentrated in it and branch out from it.

(*Fataḥ al-Bārī*, p. 133, Vol. I)

حَتّٰى اَنَّ عُلُوْمَ الشَّرِيْعَةِ كُلَّهَا رَاجِعَةٌ
اِلَيْهِ وَمُتَشَعِّبَةٌ مِّنْهُ (فتح الباری ١٣٣/١)

If this *Ḥadīth* is given the name of "*Ummussunnah*" then it will be most appropriate, since the collection of all the *Aḥādīth* is contained in it in a concise and brief form. In the arrangement of the Qur'ān, the *Sūrah al-Fātiḥah* has been placed on the top because it is the concise text of the Qur'ān and the rest is the detailed explanation. Hence, most of the exegetes and writers have placed this *Ḥadīth* in the beginning, as for example, Imām Muslim has in his *Ṣaḥiḥ Muslim* and Baghwī in his book entitled '*Maṣābīḥ wa Sharḥi Sunnah*". The writer of *Mishkāt* has, likewise, followed them. Generally, this *Ḥadīth* is known under the title of *Ḥadīth* al-Jibra'īl. This *Ḥadīth* is so comprehensive and full of meaning that, if I were to explain according to my capacity, its minute implications, then I would need at least fifteen days. But here, by way of brevity, I am explaining a few necessary points.

It is given in some narrations that this incident took place only a few months before the passing away of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). By this I mean those three months which he passed after the "*Ḥajjat al-Widā*'". This has been also stated by Ibn Ḥajar. And this is reasonable as *Dīn* (*Islam*) gradually descended over a period of twentythree years till it was completed during *Ḥajjat al-Widā*', and on the day of '*Arafah* of *Ḥajjat al-Widā*', the following *Āyah* was revealed:

> This day have I perfected your religion for you and completed my favour unto you, and have chosen for you a religion al-Islam. (Qur'ān, 5:3)

اَلْيَوْمَ اَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِيْنَكُمْ وَاَتْمَمْتُ
عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِيْ وَرَضِيْتُ لَكُمُ الْاِسْلَامَ دِيْنًا ؕ
(مائدہ، آیت ۳)

Hence, this conclusion was only possible after the completion of the religion (*Dīn*). As for example, a lecturer after speaking for two, three or four hours says "this is the sum total of my speech" so that something may be briefly remembered by everyone and may be easy to act upon. Hence, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) here stated in brief, the sum and substance of the entire religion, since *Īmān* is the name given to the sum of the entire subject-matter of beliefs. And Islam represents the sum and substance of the entire subject-matter of (religious) jurisprudence, worship and actions, and *Iḥsān* is the sum total of the subject-matter of the path of religious sanctity, *ṣufism* and purification of self. The discussions pertaining to philosophy which the *Mutakallimīn* (scholastics) have introduced, of necessity, in "'*Ilm al-Kalām*" is neither an essential ingredient of religion nor the purpose thereof. It is a great bounty and gift of God that He had been descending (the knowledge of) *Dīn* through Jibra'īl for twentythree years, and then He gave through him the summary of religion. In this connection the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: "This was Jibrā'īl who had come to teach people their religion".

This means that by the questions and the answers the people may learn the sum and substance of religion.

The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sitting before a gathering of people when a person came "Bārizan" that is he was clearly visible so that every person could recognise him. In the beginning the Prophet used to sit well mixed with the people and therefore strangers found it difficult to recognise him. Hence the Companions sought permission to erect for him an elevated place which was granted. At the time of this incident, he was probably sitting on the platform. By this, the people have concluded that there is no harm in making a separate seating arrangement for the teacher and the taught, in case of necessity. But it should be made free from show. It is therefore related about the platform of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عيله وسلم) that it was an elevated place made of clay.

"فاتاه رجل" A person came to him, that is Jibra'īl came in the form of man. Here the narration is brief. He tried all possible contrivances to hide his own identity. The details have been given in the narration by Muslim. Any one desiring to know the details should refer to "*Fatḥ al-Mulhim*" p. 162, volume I. He had adopted a strange attitude in his demeanour, appearance, manners, behaviour and talks. He had adopted an attitude of a stranger, so that no one could recognise him so much so that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not recognise him in the beginning. On his leaving, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was informed (spiritually) that he was Jibra'īl. Hence, it is mentioned in the narration of Ibn Ḥabbān that he said that, to that date he was never confused about the name of Jibra'īl, and this was the first time that Jibra'īl came and he remained unknown to him. He could not recognise him. Only when he had gone he was informed about him (spiritually). It is true that generally, whenever Jibra'īl appeared in the form of a man, he appeared in the form of Daḥyah Kalbī. But to say that in this incident also, he appeared in the form of Daḥyah is apparently wrong. Ḥafiẓ has explained that this word in the narration of Nasā'ī is due to the doubt of the Rāwī (reporter), because the narration of Muslim contains details and explanation in this connection. Ḥaḍrat 'Umar said:

شَدِيْدُ بَيَاضِ الثِّيَابِ شَدِيْدُ سَوَادِ الشَّعْرِ لَا يُرٰى عَلَيْهِ آثَرُ السَّفَرِ وَلَا يَعْرِفُهٗ مِنَّا اَحَدٌ (مسلم، كتابُ الايمان)

He was clad in white and his hair was pitch dark. There was no sign of journey visible and no one of us recognised him.

If he had appeared in the form of a Daḥyah Kalbī, then it would not have been "لايعرفه منا احد" "that no one of us recognised him". It is possible that Daḥyah Kalbī was present among them from the beginning. Now if Jibra'īl appeared in the form of Daḥyah, then the Companions were sure that it was not their Daḥyah as he was already present amidst them. Then, per force, this must be some other person who was in appearance like Daḥyah but it was not known who that was. Hence, "لايعرفه منا احد" i.e., none amongst us recognised him is correct. But from the mode of text, this argument seems to be far-fetched. Further Jibra'īl had adopted the practice of hiding his own identity on this occasion. By this reason, too, it does not seem that he had come in the form of Daḥyah. Since coming in the form of Daḥyah was a known fact, hence this is opposed to the attitude of disguise. Even the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would have known it since Jibra'īl mostly used to come in the form of Daḥyah. It is possible that, in spite of the fact that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had been endowed with all the necessary knowledge and revelation both about the past and the future, his not recognising Jibra'īl was a pointer to the fact that a creature is nothing by his own self, and it is God Almighty who exercises His power over everything. In spite of the fact that so much knowledge of realities of things had been granted to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), God may, whenever He wishes, withdraw the knowledge of things perceived and felt, not to speak of the realities and spiritual knowledge. Hence God Himself has said:

> **And if We willed we could withdraw that which We have revealed unto thee, then wouldst thou find no guardian for thee against us in respect thereof.**
> **(Qur'ān, 17:86)**

وَلَئِنْ شِئْنَا لَنَذْهَبَنَّ بِالَّذِيْٓ اَوْحَيْنَآ
اِلَيْكَ ثُمَّ لَا تَجِدُ لَكَ بِهٖ عَلَيْنَا وَكِيْلًا ۙ
(بنی اسرائیل، آیت ۸۶)

God has, by His extreme Benevolence, bestowed on him this precious gift. There could be no reason for withdrawing the same. It is only meant to assert His Omnipotence. Further on, He says:

> **(It is naught) save mercy from thy Lord. Lo! His kindness unto thee was ever great.**
> **(Qur'ān, 17:87)**

اِلَّا رَحْمَةً مِّنْ رَّبِّكَ ۭ اِنَّ فَضْلَهٗ كَانَ
عَلَيْكَ كَبِيْرًا (بنی اسرائیل، آیت ۸۷)

That is he will not do such a thing since the demand of His Mercy is that this source of redemption and benevolence should not be removed from the world. Nevertheless, if He wishes he can withdraw it as everything has been given by Him and everything belongs to Him. After diffusing through him so much knowledge of realities and knowledge of God throughout the world, He showed towards the end of the Prophet's life, by way of example that He could withdraw whenever it pleased Him the knowledge of such things as could be perceived and felt. What then could be the fate of others? In fact, even after twentythree years of contact with Jibra'īl, he remained disguised from the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), then, what can be the condition of others? Hence, man should not boast and pride over any thing. There is an incident of Mawlānā Muḥammad Ya'qūb Nānotwī, that a person came to him for his signature on a *Fatwā* (religious verdict). He said, he had his pen in his hand, but could not remember his own name. He concentrated deeply, and only after a long time, he could remember his name. Mawlānā Thānwī, after describing this incident, has narrated an incident of his own. He said his house was very near to the Khānaqāh (monastery) and he used to come and go daily, but one day he completely forgot his own house, when he started to go home. He knocked about in the lane in search of the house but was not able to trace it. Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Muḥammad Ya'qūb and Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Thānwī are well-known for their dignified position in the knowledge of religion, and spiritual realities. In spite of this, they forgot their name and house respectively. In the above quoted incident, the Prophet's not recognising Jibra'īl was a prelude to the question and answer to the knowledge of the Hour (Last Day), that its knowledge was not given to him, since a person can have the knowledge of a thing only when he has been given that by God.

> **Be glorified We have no knowledge saving that which Thou hast taught us.**
> **(Qur'ān, 2:32)**

سُبْحٰنَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَآ اِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا (بقرہ، آیت ۳۲)

Without the gift from God, the creatures have not even the knowledge of things seen and felt.

And he فَقَالَ مَا الْاِيْمَانُ قَالَ الْاِيْمَانُ اَنْ تُؤْمِنَ بِاللّٰهِ وَمَلٰٓئِكَتِهٖ وَبِلِقَآئِهٖ وَرُسُلِهٖ وَتُؤْمِنَ بِالْبَعْثِ asked, "What is *Īmān* (Faith)?" The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said, "It consists in your believing in God, His Angels, and about meeting Him, and in His Messengers and in rising after death." First of all, he questioned, "What is *Īmān*?" The literal meaning of *Īmān* is attestation, like "وما انت بمؤمن لنا". Giving the literal meaning would have been sufficient, but since the connection of the question was with the accessories of *Īmān* (faith), hence the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) mentioned those things which were related to *Īmān* and attestation. All these things referred to by him fall within the category of *Mughībāt*, i.e., " things unseen" or "mysteries". No acts are mentioned here. By this, the doctrine of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah is confirmed, that acts are not parts or pillars of *Īmān*. The belief in God means that His existence and His Oneness should be attested, and there should be the conviction that "He is embodiment of all the excellent qualities and is free from all defects and controls. In respect of power and knowledge, He has control over the entire world. There is no partner in His *Dhāt* (Being), nature and essence, and in His attributes. He alone is deserving of worship.

Wa Malā'ikatihī God has created the Angels who have relation with Light (being created therefrom). These are God's ambassadors and respected ones. They are such devotees that never disobey God. God has entrusted to them the administration of the universe. They can appear in different forms and figures. Of these, whose existence is known to us through established facts, such as Jibrā'īl, Mikā'īl, Isrā'fīl, and 'Izrā'īl, they should be believed in, with that reference, while belief in those whose names have not been given should be in general, and this is sufficient.

Wa Biliqā'ihī The meaning of *Liqā*' is that one should believe in meeting God. Some have interpreted *Liqā*' to mean "seeing God". Over this a doubt has been raised that all will not be lucky enough to see God. Then how is to believe in this ? No one can say (with confidence) that he will be granted the vision of God, since this depends on a person's death professing *Īmān* to his last breath, but no one knows what his end will be. The answer to this is that it is not intended that the belief should be in one's own, or any particular person's ability to see God, but the belief, in short, is that a Muslim will be able to see God. To make objection that all will not be able to see God, an argument about denial of seeing God, is not understood. This is something very strange indeed. Where is the difficulty in the mere belief in the possibility of seeing God? Don't we believe in Paradise and Hell? Is it that all those who believe will go to Paradise or Hell? When this is not the case, then it is legitimate to believe in the possibility of *Liqā'* (meeting) and *rūyat* (seeing) God. Some people contended that *Liqā*' means being present in the Court of God (on the Day of Judgment).

Wa Rasūlihī (and in His Prophets) Belief in and attestation of the prophethood of prophets and things connected therewith are constituents of faith (*Īmān*). God sent this community (of Prophets) for presenting to the people the message of God, and kept them (the Prophets) protected from sins. They had to cross many hurdles on their way, but they never showed negligence in spreading the message of God. Belief and attestation, in some of them is in detail and in others in brief. Those Prophets who have been dealt with, at length, it is necessary to attest them in detail. And those who have been included in "among them are those whom We have not mentioned to thee", attestation of them in brief is sufficient.

Wa Tu'mina Bil Ba'thi (and believe in the Resurrection). Prior to this the mention of "*Īmān Billāh*", "*Īmān bil Malā'ikah*", "*Īmān bi Liqā'ihī*" and "*Īmān bil Rusul*" was made under the word "*Tu'min*". Here, the word "*Tu'min*" is used once more with "*Ba'th*". From this it is clear that the attestation of the belief in rising after death has a special place in the Islamic beliefs. By this, is meant the belief in rising from the grave, then thereafter in accountability, "*Ṣirāṭ*", the Bridge that everyone would have to cross on the Day of Judgment, Balance, Paradise and Fire (i.e. Hell) etc. But by the repetition of the word "*tu'min*" it is intended to show that "*Īmān bi liqā'ihī*" and "*Īmān bil ba'thi*" are two separate things. All the things which are indicated by the word "Liqa' " are present at the moment. But rising after death is not present at this juncture, but is a thing which would come in future. The further difference is that by "Ba'th" is meant rising from the graves, which will take place first and by "Liqā' " is meant "seeing God" which will take place later. Hence the question of repeating the same thing does not arise.

The second question that the man put was "What is Islam?" The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said that it consists in not associating any one in the worship of God (that is not worshipping any one except God). There is an indication in "لاتشرک به" i.e., "Do not associate anyone with Him" deserves to be worshipped with full devotion and reverence. No one else has any right to such devoted worship and supplication.

Then he said: "Say prayers and pay Zakāt (poor-due) which are obligatory". Here the word "*Mafrūḍah*" has been used only with reference to poor-due. In another narration, the word "*maktūbah*" has been used with "*Ṣalāt*" and in another, the words "*wa taṣūma Ramaḍāna.*" This is another narration in which *Ḥajj* is mentioned along with Fasting.

The third question the man put was "what is *Iḥsān* (goodness)." In reply to this the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) replied "ان تعبد الله کانک تراه" "Worship God in such a way as if you are seeing Him." This is a more dignified condition of mind and heart. In that condition a man perceives God in such a way as if he is seeing Him with his own eyes. But if he has not that perception of God in his heart he may still have the consciousness that God, the Almighty, is observing every action and condition of his, and it is this point to which the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has hinted: "If you do not see Him, then He is observing you."

The real implications of Iman, Islam and Ihsan

To understand the essence of these three terms you should realise that a man has a soul and a body. The body becomes entirely paralysed and useless without the soul. In the same way, the soul cannot accomplish many things without the body. The soul is hidden. Its reflection is cast on the parts of the body. After the body and soul, there is a third thing which appears in the form of regular movement of the parts of body, through consistency of efforts, through the coordination of the body and soul. It is the law of God, that whichever power that is used regularly and according to fixed rules, increases in its magnitude. As for example, wherefrom do the wrestlers derive so much drive and strength? Does it fall from the heavens on them like the rains? The fact is that when a person uses the parts of his body, according to set rules and exercises them regularly, so that every part of the body is brought into action, gradually, by steady and sure degrees, they increase in strength and he becomes a wrestler. But on the contrary, if a person does not make any movement of his limbs for a considerably long time and for instance, he keeps in bed for twentyfour hours and does not move any part of his body at all, instead of becoming a wrestler, he will be paralysed and become totally disabled. As this is apparent in the bodily powers, in the same way is the condition of the spiritual powers, nay, to a greater extent, as the real powers are of the soul. The special powers and capabilities that appear from constant practice is known as "*Iḥsān*" in the same way as the increase in strength of the body is known as "wrestling". The fact is that the real thing is *Īmān* (faith) and it originates in the heart, and when faith acquires progress and overflows, its effect is apparent on limbs of the body. The Prophets (peace be on them) are the great masters of this art. With constant progress *Īmān* becomes Islam, and the same Islam through progress becomes *Iḥsān*. Then there are quite a number of grades and categories of "*Iḥsān*". One grade is owned by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), one by the Companions of the Prophet. Then there are grades of the Saints and Reformers according to their capacities and status.

Religious laws, mystic path, spiritual knowledge

From the above discussion it is evident that the claim of the ignorant Ṣūfīs (mystics) that the "Ṭarīqat" (mystic path) is something apart from "Sharī'at" (religious laws) is totally incorrect. These people, on account of their ignorance, have fallen into deception. "*Sharī'at*" is the sum total of *Īmān* and Islam. By regular and systematic observance of "*Sharī'at*" (laws of religion) and constant efforts in that direction, "*Iḥsān*" is acquired; this is "*Ṭarīqat*", the mystic path. Then some spiritual fruits are received in this world which have been termed spiritual knowledge.

The stage of being chosen and of turning (towards God)

In this system, there are two kinds of people—one comprises "*Mujtabā*", i.e., the "chosen" and the other "*Munīb*", those "that turn to God". "*Mujtabā*" are those people who have been specially chosen by God, and God draws them towards Himself and due to this special attraction of God, they are not required to undergo intensive austerity in the spiritual path, and hence they are also called "*Majdhūb*" (drawn towards God). The "*Munīb*", however, plod their way through efforts, extreme austerity, and perseverance. Here, too, the help of God is present, otherwise it will not be possible to budge an inch. But they lack that special favour which is available to the "*Mujtabā*". The Holy Qur'ān has pointed to this:

Allāh chooseth for Himself whom He will and guideth unto Himself him who turneth (towards Him).

(Qur'ān 42:13)

اَللّٰهُ يَجْتَبِىْٓ اِلَيْهِ مَنْ يَّشَآءُ وَيَهْدِىْٓ اِلَيْهِ
مَنْ يُّنِيْبُ (شوریٰ، آیت ۱۳)

Whomsoever of his servants He wishes, He draws to Himself and through His mercy and love bestows a place of nearness and preference. To reward those who are striving hard, and to guide them and lead them to success is also His work. All the Prophets belong to the class of "*Mujtabā*", but there are, among them, too, grades and categories. Nevertheless, whether they are "*Mujtabā*" or "*Munīb*", their underlying idea is the same, that is: "Worship God in such a way as if you are seeing Him, and if you do not see Him then He is observing you". In the interpretation and explanation of these two sentences there is difference of opinion among the religious scholars.

Interpretation of "Ihsan" by Ibn Hajar

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is describing here two grades and two conditions, of which the former is high and sublime. If this is not available to a person, he should, at least, try for the second position, which is comparatively less elevated.

'انتعبد اللہ کانک تراہ' 'That is, keeping in mind the respect of God, pray in such a way as if you are seeing Him'. It is evident, that when a servant is before his master, and he works while seeing him, then he will work with perfect respect and attention so that there may not be any lapse in the observance of servitude and reverence. This, the Ṣūfīs call ***Mushāhadah*** (personal observation) in their own terminology. By this, it should not be misunderstood that the Ṣūfīs see God (face to face) and perform *Mushāhadah* because in the *Ṣaḥiḥ Muslim* the explanation is given that:

Know ye that you cannot see God before you die.

وَاعْلَمُوْٓا اَنَّكُمْ لَنْ تَرَوْا رَبَّكُمْ حَتّٰى تَمُوْتُوْا

Hence the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has mentioned: "As if you are seeing God" wherein *kāf* has been used for the purpose of comparison (as if) and did not say: "Thou art certainly seeing Him" so that it may not be mitsaken for *Rūyat* (actually seeing God). So when the meaning of ***Mushāhadah*** is not seeing by the eyes, then, what is the real implication of ***Mushāhadah***?

The place of "Mushahadah" (personal observation) and "Muraqabah" (meditation)

It should be remembered that the meaning of *Mushāhadah* here is that as a man has the external sight, there are also the eyes of the heart and the internal sight. Hence God has said:

For indeed it is not the eyes that grow blind, but it is the hearts which are within the bosoms that grow blind.
(Qur'ān 22:46)

فَاِنَّهَا لَا تَعْمَى الْاَبْصَارُ وَلٰكِنْ تَعْمَى الْقُلُوْبُ
الَّتِيْ فِي الصُّدُوْرِ (ع، آیۃ ٤٦)

This means that after seeing, if a man does not contemplate with the heart, it is as good as not seeing. Hence although his external eyes are open, yet the eyes of his heart are blind. Undoubtedly, the real blindness is the blindness of heart. Blindness is thus described: "العمیٰ هوعدم البصر ممن کان شانه انیکون بصیرا" (that is blindness is absence of sight because of which one is able to see). Hence, there ought to be special relationship of one's heart and eyes with God and he should be so overwhelmed by this close relationship that the condition of the devotee should become such as if he is seeing God with his open eyes. This is proved from experience that when the knowledge and conviction of a thing becomes excessive and overpowering, then it appears to him that he is seeing the thing with his eyes, as has been said by God:

Those who have been given knowledge see that what is revealed unto thee from thy Lord is the truth.
(Qur'ān 34:6)

وَيَرَى الَّذِيْنَ اُوْتُوا الْعِلْمَ الَّذِيْٓ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكَ
مِنْ رَّبِّكَ هُوَ الْحَقَّ" (سبا، آیۃ ٦)

Here the word *Yarā* has been used and not *Ya'lamu* although the knowledge of the reality of a thing is not what is to be seen (with the eyes), but it is a thing to be learnt.

But its knowledge and conviction reach a stage where it is so overwhelming and overpowering that he feels he is seeing the thing with his own physical eyes. This condition is also seen, very frequently, in those who are entangled in the worldly love, which, in fact, is not affection or love, but mostly lewdness and depravity. These people also, when they become deeply engrossed in the thought of the beloved they start imagining that they are seeing their beloved with their own eyes. Now think about those who have effaced their own existence in the Real Love, and are intoxicated with the wine of the Real Beloved, what would be their condition? This condition is attained when a devotee is totally engrossed in acquiring nearness of God, and strives hard in that direction, and is always intoxicated with His thought. Under this condition, he experiences special abundance of the illumination of the attributes and names of the Almighty God showered on him, by virtue of which his knowledge and conviction reach the aforesaid stage.

In sum, that *Mushāhadah* is not the real sight of God but when the knowledge and conviction overpower a person, its effect is felt on the external sphere also, as if he is seeing Him with his physical eyes, although in fact he is not seeing Him with his eyes. This is one stage and is an elevated position.

The other stage is somewhat lower than this and ''فانلم تکن تراه فانه یراک'', means that if you cannot attain that condition and elevation in thought that you are seeing Him, and if you cannot reach the position of *mushāhadah* then, at least, remember that God is seeing you. This should not be in the form of mere belief, since every Muslim has this belief, but it should be translated into action and should be remembered at the time of doing any action and in all conditions. This is known as the stage (position) of *Murāqabah*. This has been described by the Qur'ān as:

Is he then unaware that Allāh seeth? (Qur'ān 96:14)

اَلَمْ يَعْلَمْ بِاَنَّ اللّٰهَ يَرٰى (علق، آیت ۱۴)

That is at the time of refusing to believe God, did he not realise that the Lord of the World is seeing him? It is but natural that one who remembers and has this thought overwhelmingly present in his mind will never lack, in the slightest degree, modesty and respect, provided this is not only confined to knowledge and belief but he ever remembers it and never gives in to negligence. If ever, he commits negligence, he should at once become aware of it and does not make it a habit. This has been described by the Holy Qur'ān:

Lo! those who ward off (evil), when a glamour from the devil troubleth them, they do but remember (Allāh's Guidance) and behold them seers. (Qur'ān 7:201)

اِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ اتَّقَوْا اِذَا مَسَّهُمْ طٰٓئِفٌ مِّنَ
الشَّيْطٰنِ تَذَكَّرُوْا فَاِذَا هُمْ مُّبْصِرُوْنَ (اعراف آیت ۲۰۱)

That is, their mistake does not become prolonged and this is *Murāqabah*. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) described in these two sentences two stages. One higher and the other lower than the first one. But this interpretation of and dividing the two sentences of the *Ḥadīth* by Ibn Ḥajar to depict two different stages is debatable.

Comments of Nawawi and Mawlana Sindhi on *Iḥsān*

The much better interpretation is that which has been given by 'Allāmah Nawawī in the commentary of Muslim. Likewise, 'Allāmah has also dealt with this subject in the marginal commentary of Bukhārī. The interpretation of Mawlānā Sindhī is more meaningful than that of Nawawī. The sum total of their commentaries is that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has not described two different stages in the two sentences, but he has explained only one objective underlying the idea of both. The first sentence deals with the real objective, but there was a possibility of a doubt arising, which he has answered in the second sentence. This can be understood by an analogy. Suppose, there are some people present before a king in his palace. Now, how far these will observe the requisite respect and dignity of the court is known to everyone. There are two things here. The one is that the king is looking at them and also that they see the king. What is the reason behind this perfect observance of respect and obedience? Which reason has motivated their attitude of subservience? Is it the seeing of the king or their seeing the king? By a little deliberation, it will be clear that it is the king's seeing them (which really matters).

For instance, if there is a blind man amongst them who cannot see the king, would his observance of respect and subservience for the king be in any case less than that of the others? Never so, on the contrary, he would be more cautious at that time than the others, so that no untoward movement may take place by him, in the presence of the king. If seeing of the king had been the reason, then this blind man would not have felt the necessity of showing respect and obedience, as he could not see the king. Hence, it is clear that seeing the king or his seeing them is not the reason behind the observance of respect, dignity and subservience since those present know very well that the king is seeing them. Hence, the blind and the men of eyes, near and far, observe the requirements of respect and subservience.

For this reason, Nawawī, Sindhī and others say that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has described the same underlying idea in both the sentences, that a person should perform the prayers and worship in such a way and with such attention and presence of mind, as if he is seeing God. But if there be any doubt in this, even then he should observe the same amount of respect and subservience and pray with perfect attention and presence of mind with the conviction that God is seeing him. Because there is nothing hidden from God Almighty. He is always aware of everything, and since the motivating factor for respect and subservience is His looking, the devotee should always observe extreme type of respect and obedience and pray with perfect attention and presence of mind, whether he sees God or not. What matters really is not one's seeing Him but His seeing everyone and that He is present always and every where.

Summary

The sum and substance of all this is that the real purpose has been described in the first sentence that the prayers and worship should be performed in such a way as if we are seeing God, that is with observance of respect and subservience and perfect attention and presence of mind. In the second sentence a doubt has been removed and the reality highlighted; the real intention has been brought to light. The difference between the subject-matter of the two, pertaining to the meaning and intention, has already been explained.

If you do not (or cannot) imagine that you are seeing Him (which is the stage of *Mushāhadah*) then imagine that He is seeing you (This is the stage of *Murāqabah*).

فَاِنْ لَّمْ تَتَصَوَّرْ اَنَّكَ تَرَاهُ (اَلَّذِیْ هُوَ مَقَامُ
الْمُشَاهَدَةِ) فَتَصَوَّرْ اَنَّهٗ يَرَاكَ (اَلَّذِیْ هُوَ مَقَامُ
الْمُرَاقَبَةِ)

According to the second explanation, the text will be as follows:

If you do not see God (nevertheless) you absorb yourself in prayers with perfect goodness (*Iḥsān*) and respect because He is seeing you.

اِنْ لَّمْ تَكُنْ تَرَاهُ اِسْتَمِرَّ عَلٰٓى اِحْسَانِ الْعِبَادَةِ
وَكَمَالِ الرِّعَايَةِ لِاَنَّهٗ يَرَاكَ (رَاجِعْ اِلٰى كَلَامِ النَّوَوِیِّ
وَالسِّنْدِیِّ فِیْ فَتْحِ الْمُلْهِمْ ص ۱۶۸ ج ۱)

The mention of *Īmān* (faith), *Islam* and *Iḥsān* in the Qur'an

God, the Almighty has assembled in one place all the three, *Īmān*, *Islam* and *Iḥsān* mentioned in the ***Ḥadīth***, and has also pointed out that there are numerous grades in *Iḥsān* (goodness).

It will not be in accordance with your desires, nor the desires of the People of the Scripture. He who doth wrong will have the recompense thereof, and will not find against Allāh any protecting friend or helper. And whoso doth good works, whether male or female, and he (or she) is a believer, such will enter paradise and they will not be wronged the dint in a date-stone. (Qur'ān 4:123-124)

لَيْسَ بِاَمَانِيِّكُمْ وَلَآ اَمَانِيِّ اَهْلِ الْكِتٰبِ ؕ
مَنْ يَّعْمَلْ سُوْٓءًا يُّجْزَ بِهٖ ۙ وَلَا يَجِدْ لَهٗ مِنْ دُوْنِ
اللّٰهِ وَلِيًّا وَّلَا نَصِيْرًا ۝ وَمَنْ يَّعْمَلْ مِنَ الصّٰلِحٰتِ
مِنْ ذَكَرٍ اَوْ اُنْثٰى وَهُوَ مُؤْمِنٌ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ يَدْخُلُوْنَ
الْجَنَّةَ وَلَا يُظْلَمُوْنَ نَقِيْرًا ۝ (النسآء، آيت ۱۲۳، ۱۲۴)

This means that redemption and reward are not dependent on anyone's hope or imagination and whosoever does wrong will be taken to task. Whosoever will do virtuous deeds, provided he is a believer, will go to Paradise and will be awarded rewards for his actions. Reward and Punishment have nothing to do with the hope and desire of any one. Here, a mention of both *Islam* and *Īmān* is made. Good deeds constitute Islam. Thereafter God says:

Who is better in religion than he who surrendereth his purpose to Allāh while doing good (to men) and followeth the tradition of Abraham the Upright? Allāh (Himself) chose Abraham for Friend. (Qur'ān 4:125)

وَمَنْ اَحْسَنُ دِيْنًا مِّمَّنْ اَسْلَمَ وَجْهَهٗ لِلّٰهِ
وَهُوَ مُحْسِنٌ وَّاتَّبَعَ مِلَّةَ اِبْرٰهِيْمَ حَنِيْفًا ؕ وَاتَّخَذَ
اللّٰهُ اِبْرٰهِيْمَ خَلِيْلًا ۝ (نساء، آيت ۱۲۵)

Here, the *Iḥsān* has been mentioned and the sum of all these has been called *Dīn* (religion), which is mentioned towards the end of this *Ḥadīth*. "يعلمكم دينكم" "your religion teaches you" and this is a pointer to the fact that there are numerous grades in *Iḥsān*. and *Khullatu* (choosing one as a friend) is the highest grade of *Iḥsān*.

قَالَ مَتَى السَّاعَةُ قَالَ مَا الْمَسْئُوْلُ عَنْهَا بِاَعْلَمَ مِنَ السَّائِلِ

He asked when the Day of Judgement will take place. The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said that in this connection the replier did not know more than the questioner. At this point, a question could have been asked that the previous three questions were well connected with each other, since they described the different stages of the one reality—one was the starting point, followed by the mid-point and the last was the highest. All these three, naturally followed one another in sequence—*Īmān* (faith) itself becomes Islam after making progress, and Islam develops into *Iḥsān* (goodness). In these, there was perfect cohesion and relation. But the question about the Last Day apparently seems to be disconnected.

Arrangement of Jibra'il's questions and the connection with each other

Before answering this question, I wish to present an analogy. Imagine there is an arrangement made for a function at a particular site. Now if a stranger happens to call at the place, having no prior information as to what function is going to be held, then the first question he naturally put would be: "What is going to take place here?" "Why is this arrangement being made?" He will be told there will be a lecture here. Then he will ask which scholars will speak. He will be informed that such and such scholar will deliver a lecture here. But if he further asks as to when the lecture will be over and when the canopy will be dismantled, this question of his will be a natural one and quite relevant. The reason is that when an arrangement is made, it is undone after the purpose thereof has been achieved. The same is the case with the farmers who make incessant efforts and work to a set programme, for preparing the soil, for production. They cultivate the field, make it perfectly levelled, then they sow the seeds and water the field. All this arrangement is done in order to obtain the crop. But when the crop is ripe they cut the entire crop and leave nothing behind in the field. Now if a person, after putting questions about the details of the arrangement, also asks when all this will be done away with, this question of his cannot be said to be irrelevant, but it is in keeping with the natural sequence, since removing the arrangement after achieving the objectives is the natural outcome.

When this thing is well understood, it should be understood what the purpose of the creation of the world is, which is such an elaborate arrangement. By a little deliberation on the subject, it will be perfectly clear to anyone, that this heaven and earth and what is between them, have all been created for man: everything is for his benefit. Hence God has said:

See ye not how Allāh hath made serviceable unto you whatsoever is in the skies and whatsoever is in the earth and hath loaded you with His favours both without and within? (Qur'ān 31:20)

أَلَمْ تَرَوْا أَنَّ اللّٰهَ سَخَّرَ لَكُمْ مَّا فِي
السَّمٰوٰتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَأَسْبَغَ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعَمَهٗ
ظَاهِرَةً وَّبَاطِنَةً (لقمن، آيت ٢٠)

The favours which can be perceived with the senses or easily understood, are open favours. And those that can be unfolded with the help of reason and can be known through deliberations are hidden favours. The entire collection of the favours comprises the subjugation of the world. External favours may also mean material advantages including those relating to livelihood and subsistence, while hidden favours may include spiritual blessings and matters relating to the Hereafter. Why did then God create men? God gives the reason for the creation:

I created the Jinn and the humankind only that they might worship Me. (Qur'ān 51:56)

وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنْسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوْنِ (ذاريات، آيت ٥٦)

At another place the Qur'ān has described the matter concerning favour and the worship together.

O mankind! Worship your Lord, Who hath created you and those before you, so that ye may ward off (evil). Who hath appointed the earth a resting-place for you, and the sky a canopy; and causeth water to pour down from the sky, thereby producing fruits as food for you. And do not set up rivals to Allāh when ye know (better). (Qur'ān 2:21-22)

يٰٓاَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اعْبُدُوْا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِىْ خَلَقَكُمْ
وَالَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُوْنَ ۝ الَّذِىْ جَعَلَ
لَكُمُ الْاَرْضَ فِرَاشًا وَّالسَّمَآءَ بِنَآءً وَّاَنْزَلَ مِنَ
السَّمَآءِ مَآءً فَاَخْرَجَ بِهٖ مِنَ الثَّمَرٰتِ رِزْقًا لَّكُمْ فَلَا
تَجْعَلُوْا لِلّٰهِ اَنْدَادًا وَّاَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُوْنَ ۝ (بقرہ، آیت ۲۱، ۲۲)

Hence it is clear, that the main purpose of the creation of the world and elaborate arrangements is worship of God. For this purpose the *Jinn* and the mankind were created and the rest of the universe has been created for them. When this purpose will be served, the entire sky and the earth will be rolled up and all arrangements will come to an end. This is the meaning of "The Last Day" or "The Hour", as the purpose would have been served and there would be no more need of such arrangements. Hence, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) while raising up of his two fingers said: "بعثت انا والساعة كهاتين" "I and the Last Day *Qiyāmat* have come like this". This means that after his arrival, the Last Day is near at hand. There is no need for the arrangement of the world to last any longer, since the highest degree of worship had reached its completion in the person of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). No one had risen to such a height of devotion before him, and no person with such perfection will ever be born to rise after him. Since, in his person the completion of worship and devotion has taken place, which was the real purpose of the creation of the world, there is no need to keep this arrangement of the world intact. Hence, he said that his coming to the world is a sign that *Qiyāmat* (the Last Day) was near at hand.

A doubt

A doubt could arise here, that since the purpose of the creation of the world had been served and completed with the appearance of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), where was the need of keeping the world intact after passing away of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). The right course would have been to put an end to the world along with the passing away of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Answer

A reply to this has been given by Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nanotwī. He says that the completion of worship is of two kinds. One kind consists in the numerical strength of devotees. The other is in the qualitative discharge of duty by the subservient devotees. As far as the qualitative discharge of duty is concerned, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had attained the highest degree, as two *Rak'āt* prayers of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) far exceeded in quality and merit the entire prayers of his followers. Then quality of devotion depends on *Ma'rifat*, i.e., the knowledge of God. His *Ma'rifat* cannot be compared with the *Ma'rifat* of others: What remains is the completion of worship according to the number of the devotees. This is yet to come and will be accomplished in the future when every house will be illuminated by the light of Islam. After the completion of this, the entire universe will be folded over, as the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself has said :

Before the coming of the Last Day there will be left no house weak or strong in which God will not make Islam to enter.

لَا يَبْقٰى عَلٰى ظَهْرِ الْاَرْضِ بَيْتُ مَدَرٍ وَّلَا وَبَرٍ اِلَّا
اَدْخَلَهُ اللّٰهُ الْاِسْلَامَ

This will take place after the descent of Ḥaḍrat 'Īsā. When this quantitative completion has taken place, it will be the time to wind up all mundane affairs as declared by the Qur'ān. When the earth will be rent asunder, on the day when the skies will dash together and the mountains will move from their places; that will be the Day of Resurrection and the Last Hour. Nevertheless, we want to show that the purpose of the creation of the world is worship, about the completion of which Jibra'īl had put the questions, since *Iḥsān* implies completion of the highest degree of worship. Now the question remains that after attainment, of this highest grade in worship, known as *Iḥsān*, when will this arrangement that is the world, be folded up, which act is called *Qiyāmat* or The Hour? Hence this question of Jibra'īl is in keeping with the relevancy of the topic, as described by analogy. As the completion of worship, that is *Iḥsān*, is naturally connected with The Hour, hence it is also relevant to the topic, under consideration.

A very wonderful and delicate thing is that, when God will withdraw the arrangement of the world this will not be done haphazardly, but it will be done in an orderly manner. The first House built on the earth, as stated in the Qur'ān,

Lo! the first Sanctuary appointed for mankind was that at Bakkah (i.e., Makkah).	إِنَّ أَوَّلَ بَيْتٍ وُّضِعَ لِلنَّاسِ لَلَّذِي بِبَكَّةَ
(Qur'ān 3:96)	(آلِ عمران، آیت ۹۶)

and which on this earth, undoubtedly, is like a Royal Camp, will be the first to be removed. The details of this will be given, God Willing, in the book *Al-Ḥajj*. To this fourth question, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) replied:

"The one who has been questioned is مَا الْمَسْئُولُ عَنْهَا بِأَعْلَمَ مِنَ السَّائِلِ not more informed than the one who has put the question."

This means that we know only that *Qiyāmat* will certainly take place, but when it will take place is neither known to you nor to me.

There is a narration in the "Nawādiri Hamīdī" that Ḥaḍrat 'Īsā put the question to Jibra'īl about the exact day of the *Qiyāmat*. To this Jibra'īl said: "The one who has been questioned is not more informed than the one who has put the question." Perhaps God had put the words in the mouth of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) so that Jibra'īl may be reminded that he had himself previously given the same reply to Ḥaḍrat 'Īsā. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not give the brief answer "لست باعلم بها منک" "I know nothing more than you do", but replied that "The answerer is not more informed than the questioner", but said and made it clear that here there was no difference between the two. In the words, "the questioner" and "the replier", both are poised on the same level. No one has been given the knowledge thereof. Further, he said: "ساخبرک عن اشراطها" "But I will tell you about its signs." The Last Day is not known, but some of the signs are: When the maid-slave would bear her master as her child. There is an indication that the maid-slave will give birth to many children and the mother will assume the place of servant. Her position will become so much debased as if she is the property of her children's father. There are also instances when kings were born of maids, and those maids (mothers of the kings) became their subjects. As the king is the master and benefactor of his subjects, the son, on being crowned, becomes the lord and benefactor of his own mother.

There are also instances when the pregnant maid-servants were sold as slaves and were unknowingly bought by their own sons, or the sons treated their mothers in such a way as if they were their servants, and the sons were the masters and benefactors of their own mothers.

فِيْ خَمْسٍ لَا يَعْلَمُهُنَّ إِلَّا اللّٰهُ ثُمَّ تَلَا النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ عِنْدَهٗ عِلْمُ السَّاعَةِ That is, the knowledge of the Last Day is among those five things which none but God alone knows. Then the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) recited the following *Āyah* :

> Lo! Allāh! With Him is knowledge of the Hour. He sendeth down the rain, and knoweth that which is in the wombs. No soul knoweth what it will earn tomorrow, and no soul knoweth in what land it will die. Lo! Allāh is Knower, Aware.
>
> (Qur'ān 31:34)

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ عِنْدَهٗ عِلْمُ السَّاعَةِ ۚ وَيُنَزِّلُ
الْغَيْثَ ۚ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا فِي الْأَرْحَامِ ۗ وَمَا تَدْرِيْ
نَفْسٌ مَّاذَا تَكْسِبُ غَدًا ۗ وَمَا تَدْرِيْ نَفْسٌ
بِأَيِّ أَرْضٍ تَمُوْتُ ۗ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ عَلِيْمٌ خَبِيْرٌ (لقمٰن آية ٣٤)

Two doubts have been expressed about the declaration that knowledge of these five things is confined to God alone.

Universal knowledge is the attribute of God alone

The first is that innumerable events and happenings in the lives of the saints are apparently not in consonance with this exclusive Divine attribute. There have been instances when some of the saints had known before hand, when, in which particular hour and at which place their death would take place. In the same way, regarding *Māfil arḥām* (what is in the wombs), there is an event narrated about Ḥaḍrat Ṣiddīq Akbar, that he knew before his death that his wife had a female child in her womb. For this reason, when he was doing the distribution of his assets, he made a will before his daughter Ḥaḍrat 'Āyishah saying that she had another sister, although the child was, at that time, in the womb of her mother. 'Abdullāh Shāh was a saint in the Punjāb. He was the *Khalīfah* (successor) of Ḥaḍrat Shāh 'Abd al-Raḥīm, and hence, he was brother in fraternity to Ḥaḍrat Miyānjī Nūr Muḥammad Jhanjhānavī. When handing over the amulet for *throes of labour*, he also used to indicate whether a male or a female child would be born. This was his well known miracle. In the like manner, predictions of astrologers and astronomers also come out to be true at times.

In order to understand the reply to this objection, it is necessary to understand the following, by way of introduction. If a thing has certain principles and certain branches, then the real knowledge of it will consist in having a full and comprehensive knowledge of the basic principles and laws. If knowledge of some details of these basic principles, though they might run into millions, does not lead to the overall knowledge of basic facts, then in reality, it cannot be called the knowledge of the particular thing, and the knower of such individual parts cannot be designated as *'Ālim* (well versed in that thing). Although, this is also knowledge according to the literal meaning of the word, and from the dictionary meaning he may be called an *'Ālim.* Take the example of the Science of Medicine. If a person happens to know by heart the names of a number of diseases and their remedies he cannot be called a doctor or an expert in knowledge thereof, unless he is an expert in and is acquainted with the entire Science of Medicine, although according to the literal meaning, some grasp of certain elementary points of the Science of Medicine may also be described as 'Knowledge'. Similarly, a jurist is one who is expert in the knowledge of the entire principles of jurisprudence, and the issues involved. If a person commits to memory *Bihishtī Zevar* (a book containing religious instructions), he cannot be called a jurist. If a man learns by heart hundreds of thousands of verses, from various books, but is not aware of the rules of poetry he cannot be called a poet. At the most we can say that such and such person knows by heart a number of verses. I hope the reader will now fully appreciate that the knowledge of all basic hidden things is the special attribute of God alone, but it is possible that knowledge of some scattered parts and rudiments thereof may be received by many. The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) received such a great share of the knowledge of these scattered parts and rudiments that it is impossible to describe them. But the rudimental knowledge of parts, even if they run into thousands and millions, is not the real knowledge, although such parts may be described as "rudimentary knowledge". As explained earlier, the real knowledge is the comprehensive knowledge of principles, and is confined to God alone. Nevertheless, the Prophets are informed of some principles for law-making, according to their prophetic mission. This is then received as a legacy by religious scholars of the community, in keeping with their capability.

There is a pointer to this in the Holy Qur'ān :

(He is) the Knower of the Unseen, and He revealeth unto none His secret, save unto every messenger whom He hath chosen, and then He maketh a guard to go before him and a guard behihd him.
(Qur'ān 72:26-27)

عٰلِمُ الْغَيْبِ فَلَا يُظْهِرُ عَلٰى غَيْبِهٖٓ اَحَدًاۙ
اِلَّا مَنِ ارْتَضٰى مِنْ رَّسُوْلٍ فَاِنَّهٗ يَسْلُكُ مِنْۢ
بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَمِنْ خَلْفِهٖ رَصَدًا (جن، آیت ۲۶، ۲۷)

The word "اظہار" "revealing" implies possession and influence over a thing. The meaning is that God does not bestow total possession or influence to any one over His knowledge of the Unseen, by which all the particulars may come under his control. At the time of revelation of a verse, (before and after it) angels as guards are posted so that Satan may not be able to interfere with it in any way, and the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) himself may not misunderstand it. This is meant by saying that the Prophets possess chastity (in their knowledge and information), which is not possessed by others. Hence, there is no room even for the slightest doubt in the knowledge of Prophets. Hence, by the exception is meant the totality of those very things, which are connected with the office of their Prophethood that is religious laws, and the species of commandments and not with the creation and the nature of creation. Hence, in the following *Āyah* God says :

That He may know that they have indeed conveyed the messages of their Lord.
(Qur'ān 72:28)

لِيَعْلَمَ اَنْ قَدْ اَبْلَغُوْا رِسٰلٰتِ رَبِّهِمْ (جن، آیت ۲۸)

That is, this perfect arrangement of safeguarding the revelation by the guards before and after it, is meant for the purpose of ascertaining that the angels have delivered to the Prophets or the Prophets have delivered to the people the exact messages of God without curtailing the same. By *Risālat* is here meant religious laws and commandments. The office of Prophethood is concerned with the propagation of the religious laws and commandments, and not with the creation. Nevertheless, knowledge of some of the fundamentals of the type is also given to the Prophets to the extent of necessity. This is because the orders concerning the particulars will appear in abundance upto the Last Day. How far they will go on counting the particulars. Hence, some general rules have also been shown to them. Till the Last Day, their successors will elucidate and explain the details in every age.

The title of *'Ālim al-Ghayb* (Knower of the Unseen)

Our discussion centres round the creation of the Unseen. The knowledge of its principles belongs only to God. No one whether he be an angel who enjoys the nearness of God, or the Prophet, has been given access to it. In reality, it is *'Ilm al-Ghayb* (knowledge of the Unseen) and *'Ālim al-Ghayb* is only God and this title is especially for Him. But the knowledge of scattered particulars is not *'Ilm al-Ghayb* and is not confined to the Prophets. This knowledge of the scattered particulars is also available to many of the saints and others, although due to the literal meaning this knowledge of particulars is included in the knowledge of the Unseen. But if any one, due to this literal meaning of the word, takes it to mean *'Ilm al-Ghayb*, even then, it will not be correct, as from the above discussion it is clear that only that person can be called knower of a thing who possesses the knowledge of the principles and fundamentals of that thing. The real knowledge is that of the principles and by reason of this the word *'Ālim al-Ghayb* (used for other than God) will be incorrect and without meaning. As the Title *'Ālim al-Ghayb* belongs exclusively to God, it is not proper from the religious point of view (even if it may be true a thousand times from the point of view of the literal meaning) to use it for a person other than God. Hence, in the Qur'ān and the *Ḥadīth* the title of *'Ālim al-Ghayb* is never used for anyone other than God. This is (that is to use it for other is) something like saying the following :

I bear animosity to Truth and certainty.

إِنِّي أُبْغِضُ الْحَقَّ وَالْيَقِينَ

and to take truth and conviction to mean "death" as death will certainly take place, or a person may say :

I flee from mercy.

إِنِّي أَفِرُّ مِنَ الرَّحْمَةِ

and take mercy to mean rain, as God himself has interpreted rain as mercy, or he may say:

I love mischief ('temptation').

إِنِّي أُحِبُّ الْفِتْنَةَ ۔

and take *Fitnah* (temptation) to mean wealth and children as said by the Qur'ān.

Your wealth and your children are only a temptation. (Qur'ān 64:15)

إِنَّمَا أَمْوَالُكُمْ وَأَوْلَادُكُمْ فِتْنَةٌ (تغابن، آیت ۱۵)

He might say:

I am an infidel or I am not a believer.

إِنِّي كَافِرٌ أَوْ لَسْتُ بِمُؤْمِنٍ ۔

and he would take it to mean being a disbeliever in Satan and not being a believer in Satan as *Kāfir Biṭ-Ṭāghūt* disbelieving in Satan, etc., have been mentioned in the Qur'ān. Hence, inspite of the apparently correct meaning, it is not proper to say such things. Although the purpose is correct but being doubtful in meaning, it is either forbidden or improper.

An anecdote about Imam Malik

Imām Dār al-Hijrat, Imām Mālik had performed many *Ḥajj*. In his last days, he once again thought of performing *Ḥajj* but he was doubtful whether he would be able to return to Madīnah or not. Imām Mālik was extremely attached to Madīnah and wanted to breathe his last on the sacred soil. So he was afraid that should he die outside, he might remain outside Madīnah. He used to be favoured daily to see the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). He thought he would ask the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) how long he would live more. If it is more, then he would perform the *Ḥajj* otherwise not. When he met the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) he put the question. He did not say anything in reply with his tongue, but in reply raised five fingers of his hand. Now Imām Mālīk was confused whether it meant five days, five months or five years. Then, a person expert in interpretation of dreams said that none of those things were meant and that, what the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) meant was that, it referred to those five things, the knowledge of which especially belongs to God and no one else knows about it.

Keys of the invisible

The knowledge of the invisible (that is complete knowledge) of a thing serves as a key for the knowledge of its parts. Hence the Qur'ān says :

And with Him are the keys of the invisible. None but He knoweth them.	وَعِنْدَهٗ مَفَاتِحُ الْغَيْبِ لَا يَعْلَمُهَآ اِلَّا هُوَ
(Qur'ān 7:59)	(انعام، آیت ۵۹)

The meaning is that the wealth of the Unseen and its keys belong to God. Only He can open the treasury to anyone, to the extent and at the time, He wishes. It is not possible for any one to reach the knowledge about the Unseen by his senses, wisdom and power of perception, since the keys of the Unseen have not been entrusted to him. The knowledge of the principles and the fundamentals which would be called "knowledge of invisible" has been exclusively kept by God.

Why were five unseen things particularised ?

The point to be considered is : why Allāh's unlimited knowledge was compressed into five invisible things only, vide the Qur'ānic verse, Lo ! Allāh ! With Him is knowledge of the Hour. He sendeth down the rain, and knoweth that which is in the wombs. No soul knoweth what it will earn tomorrow, and no soul knoweth in what land it will die. Lo ! Allāh is Knower, Aware. (Qur'ān, 31 : 34).

Shaykh Jalāluddīn Sayūṭī has mentioned *Ḥadīth* in *Lubāb al-Nuqūl* and *al-Durrul Manthūr* to the effect that the Qur'ānic verse was revealed in reply to a person who asked the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) about those five things only; otherwise Allāh's knowledge is like a vast sea which cannot be exhausted or compressed. Hence, the Qur'ānic verse mentions only those five things which are described in *Aḥādīth* as *Mafāīḥul-Ghayb* (i.e., keys of the unseen or invisible) and which are known exclusively to Allāh.

As a matter of fact, all unseen things are broadly classified into (i) things concerning the teachings of Islam. Such things are known to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), other Apostles of Allāh and some chosen Muslim divines also. These things are not the subject-matter of the present discourse. (ii) Things regarding the fundamentals of the administration of the universe. Such things are not known to any body else than Allāh. Such invisible things are unlimited but they can be compressed into five, viz. (i) relating to place (ii) relating to the past time, (iii) relating to the present time, (iv) relating to the future time and

(v) relating to the Day of Resurrection. As the last item is a unique and very important matter, it is separately mentioned in the Qur'ānic verse, viz. "عنده علم الساعة اى علم وقت وقوعها" "He alone has the knowledge of the time of the Day of Resurrection". "باى ارض تموت" "In what place one will die" is an example of the item No. 1 (mentioned above). "يعلم ما فى الارحام" "He knows what is in the wombs" and "ماذا تكسب غدا" "What one will earn tomorrow" are examples of the item No. 3 and No. 4. The Qur'ānic verse "ينزل الغيث" "He sends down the rain" may be an example of the item No. 2. Though rain is a visible matter it is caused by various factors known to the people, yet the exact place, time and quantity of rainfall are known to Allāh alone.

The meaning of *Ghayb* (unseen)

Ghayb (invisible or unseen) means that thing which is not known by senses and not understood by common reasoning (as it is said clearly by Rāghib). As regards those unseen things which are known to Allāh alone, the condition is that there is no proof or evidence in support of them, as it is detailed in *Rūḥul Ma'ānī* under "يؤمنون بالغيب" "who believe in the unseen". If any thing is known by signs or instruments, e.g. by seeing clouds we know that there will be rain, or by means of thermometer we know the temperature, it will not be called knowledge of the unseen. Moreover, knowledge by observations and experiments is not free from doubts. A doctor by means of certain instruments and X-Ray can say whether a child in the womb of mother is male or female, but his knowledge is not always correct.

It is said that the person who asked the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) about unseen things was Jibra'īl whose object was to teach religious matters to the Muslims.

قَالَ أَبُو عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ جَعَلَ ذٰلِكَ كُلَّهُ مِنَ الْإِيمَانِ

Imām Bukhārī says that all the above things are part of Īmān (Faith). All Muslims must believe that many things are exclusively known to Allāh and it is Allāh who knows the exact time of the Day of Resurrection.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

49. We have been told by Ibrāhīm bin Ḥamzah who said that he was informed by Ibrāhīm bin Sa'd via Ṣāliḥ via Ibn Shihāb via 'Ubaydullāh bin 'Abdullāh that 'Abdullāh bin 'Abbās told him:

✱ Abū Sufyān bin Ḥarb informed me that Heraculius had told him, "I asked you whether they (Muslims) were increasing or decreasing. You said that they were increasing, and such is the case of *Imān* (Faith) till it is completed. And I asked you whether any person after accepting Islam discarded it out of disgust (*with his religion*), You said "No". Such is the condition of *Imān* when its happiness occupies hearts, none can dislike it.

بَابٌ 38

49. حَدَّثَنَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ حَمْزَةَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ عَنْ صَالِحٍ عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ عَنْ عُبَيْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ أَنَّ عَبْدَ اللّٰهِ بْنَ عَبَّاسٍ أَخْبَرَهُ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنِي أَبُو سُفْيَانَ بْنُ حَرْبٍ أَنَّ هِرَقْلَ قَالَ لَهُ سَأَلْتُكَ هَلْ يَزِيدُونَ أَمْ يَنْقُصُونَ فَزَعَمْتَ أَنَّهُمْ يَزِيدُونَ وَكَذٰلِكَ الْإِيمَانُ حَتّٰى يَتِمَّ وَسَأَلْتُكَ هَلْ يَرْتَدُّ أَحَدٌ سَخْطَةً لِدِينِهِ بَعْدَ أَنْ يَدْخُلَ فِيهِ فَزَعَمْتَ أَنْ لَا وَكَذٰلِكَ الْإِيمَانُ حِينَ تُخَالِطُ بَشَاشَتُهُ الْقُلُوبَ لَا يَسْخَطُهُ أَحَدٌ۔

Reason for the chapter without subject-matter

Imām Bukhārī has not mentioned the subject-matter of this chapter, and in some editions of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* even the word "chapter" is omitted. Hence this *Ḥadīth* will be regarded "as an adjunct to the last chapter. Imām Bukhārī has said earlier that *Īmān*, *Islam* and *Iḥsān* are all parts of religion, and now he says that when religion is composed of three things, it will have increase and decrease. The words of Heraclius, "Are the Muslims increasing" point to the same idea. It was stated in the *Ḥadīth* of Jibra'īl that *Īmān* and religion are used for each other, and now Bukhārī intends to substantiate his theory by referring to the conversation of the Roman emperor, Heraclius, because in previous religions also *Īmān* and *Dīn* were used in each other's place. He enquired,

هَلْ يَرْتَدُّ أَحَدٌ سَخْطَةً لِدِينِهِ بَعْدَ أَنْ يَدْخُلَ

"Whether any person after embracing Islam discarded it out of dlsgust with it (his religion)", Abū Sufyān replied in the negative, (Here the word *Dīn* meaning religion has been used). Heraclius said,

وَكَذَلِكَ الْإِيمَانُ حِينَ تُخَالِطُ بَشَاشَتُهُ الْقُلُوبَ لَا يَسْخَطُهُ أَحَدٌ

Such is the case of *Īmān* when its happiness merges in hearts none can dislike it. Heraclius used *Dīn* in his question and *Īmān* in his reply. This shows that both the terms in his opinion were synonymous. Imām Bukhārī has already proved that *Īmān*, *Kufr*, *Islam*, *Nifāq* and *Iḥsān* have various degrees. This difference may be either in quantity as the words of Heraclius "Such is the case of *Īmān* till it is completed" indicate, i.e., the number of Muslim will increase, or in quality, as his words "Such is the condition of *Īmān* when its happiness occupies hearts" show, i.e., the nature and quality of *Īmān* is described.

Shaykh al-Hind's view

Shaykh al-Hind Maulānā Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan is of the opinion that this chapter modifies the scope of the *Ḥadīth* "A Believer's fear is that his work may be in vain (may lose its value). Imām Bukhārī has previously said on the basis of arguments that a Believer must not neglect *'amal* (work) on any account, because such neglect is the result of *Nifāq* (hypocrisy), and the belief of such a person is always in danger. Now Imām Bukhārī seeks to make some compensation by saying in this chapter that when belief is firmly rooted in one's heart, no power can dislodge it. In this way the subject-matter of the chapter may be "None can misguide a person who is guided by Allāh".

Partition of *Ḥadīth*

Imām Bukhārī has brought one piece of the *Ḥadīth* of Heraclius here in support of his theory. He has described this conversation of Heraclius in the chapter on *Waḥī* (Revelation) and the whole *Ḥadīth* in the chapter on *Jihād*. To divide a *Ḥadīth* into parts is called *Kharm* according to *Muḥaddithīn* (Traditionists). Bukhārī has often done so in support of his views. Some scholars of *Ḥadīth* hold that the system of *Kharm* is disallowed, and others say that it is allowed. The correct view is that if partition of a *Ḥadīth* changes its meaning as a whole, it is not permissible otherwise there is no harm. Imām Bukhārī always remains within reasonable limits; so there is no objection to his use of *Kharm*.

CHAPTER XXXIX

The excellence of a man who avoids sins for the sake of his religion.

50. We have been told by Abū Na'īm who said that he was informed by Zakarīyā via 'Āmir that he (the latter) heard :

✶ Al-Nu'mān ibn Bashir say :

The Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said :

بَابٌ 39 فَضْلِ مَنِ اسْتَبْرَأَ لِدِينِهِ

50. حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو نُعَيْمٍ حَدَّثَنَا زَكَرِيَّا عَنْ
عَامِرٍ قَالَ سَمِعْتُ النُّعْمَانَ ابْنَ بَشِيرٍ يَقُولُ
سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ

الْحَلَالُ بَيِّنٌ وَّالْحَرَامُ بَيِّنٌ وَبَيْنَهُمَا مُشَبَّهَاتٌ
لَا يَعْلَمُهَا كَثِيرٌ مِّنَ النَّاسِ فَمَنِ اتَّقَى الْمُشَبَّهَاتِ
اِسْتَبْرَأَ لِدِيْنِهٖ وَعِرْضِهٖ وَمَنْ وَّقَعَ فِي الشُّبُهَاتِ
كَرَاعٍ يَّرْعٰى حَوْلَ الْحِمٰى يُوْشِكُ اَنْ يُّوَاقِعَهٗ اَلَا
وَاِنَّ لِكُلِّ مَلِكٍ حِمًى اَلَا اِنَّ حِمَى اللّٰهِ فِيْ اَرْضِهٖ
مَحَارِمُهٗ اَلَا وَاِنَّ فِي الْجَسَدِ مُضْغَةً اِذَا صَلَحَتْ
صَلَحَ الْجَسَدُ كُلُّهٗ وَاِذَا فَسَدَتْ فَسَدَ الْجَسَدُ
كُلُّهٗ اَلَا وَهِيَ الْقَلْبُ ؞

"Lawful and unlawful things are evident and in between them there are doubtful things which many people do not know. Hence whosoever guards himself against suspicious matters, protects his religion and his position. And whosoever is a victim to suspicious matters is like a shepherd who grazes (his animals) near the meadow which may enter unto the royal meadow of a king. Beware! Every king has a meadow and forbidden matters are the meadow of Allāh on the earth. Beware!

There is a piece of flesh in body; and if it is in good order, the whole body will be safe and sound, and if it is in disorder the whole body will be spoiled. Beware! That is heart."

The object and connection with the subject-matter

The object of the *Ḥadīth* is that every Muslim must keep his religion above all kinds of doubts and suspicions. Imām Bukhārī's object is to demonstrate that as *Īmān* (belief), *Kufr* (disbelief), *Ẓulm* (injustice) and *Nifāq* (hypocrisy) have various ranks and degrees so also *piety or chastity has*. *Taqwā* signifies to fear Allāh and to give up evil deeds for the sake of Allāh. Its highest position is to abandon disbelief and polytheism, the second is to abstain from major sins, the third is to give up minor sins and the fourth is to avoid all doubtful matters. Imām Ghazālī calls it "piety of virtuous persons". There is a still higher rank of piety which is described in *Tirmidhī Sharīf* as follows:

لَا يَبْلُغُ الْعَبْدُ حَقِيْقَةَ التَّقْوٰى حَتّٰى يَدَعَ مَا
لَا بَأْسَ بِهٖ حَذَرًا لِّمَا بِهٖ بَأْسٌ

No person can attain to the essence of piety and chastity until he gives up even permissible things lest he should be entangled in unlawful matters.

Imām Ghazzālī calls it "piety of the chaste persons." There is one more eminent degree of piety, namely to abstain from such lawful things as are not motivated by piety. Imam names it as "Piety of truthful person."

These are various ranks of piety, and each rank has different grades.

Nu'mān bin Bashīr was one of Junior Companions of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) and he heard this *Ḥadīth* from the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). It is also recorded in some version of the *Ḥadīth* that Nu'mān pointing to his ears said 'I heard the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) with these ears of mine." Thus it is wrong to assert that Nu'mān did not hear anything direct from the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

The meaning of the *Ḥadīth* اَلْحَلَالُ بَيِّنٌ وَّالْحَرَامُ بَيِّنٌ وَّمَا بَيْنَهُمَا مُشْتَبِهَاتٌ is that lawful things are quite evident and unlawful things are also quite evident, and the intermediate stages (between the two) are doubtful. The word مشتبهات and similar words bearing the same meaning are derived from شبہ which signifies doubt. The substance of the *Ḥadīth* is that all those matters which the religion of Islam has declared lawful are as clear as day light, and similarly those things, which Islam has declared unlawful are quite evident, whereas all other matters which are not covered by the above are doubtful. The Qur'ān says :

أَحَلَّ اللّٰهُ الْبَيْعَ وَحَرَّمَ الرِّبٰوا (بقره، آيت ۲۷۵)

Allāh permitteth trading and forbiddeth usury. (Qur'ān, 2:275)

Detailed discussion on *Mushtabahāt*

It cannot be gainsaid that some matters are not as evident as trading and usury are. Their lawfulness or unlawfulness is a secret matter which is to be considered and decided by learned scholars. Again, we are to consider whether some cases are doubtful from the standpoint of religion or they have become doubtful according to our opinion—otherwise they are evident. The scholars have discussed these two points in detail, which I summarise below in my own way :

There are four sources of Islamic law, namely (i) The Qu'rān, (ii) *Sūnnati Rasūl* (iii) *Ijmā'* (Consensus of opinion) and (iv) *Qiyās* (Analogy). If lawfulness or unlawfulness of anything is proved by any one of the sources of Islamic law, it will be accepted and there must not be any doubt about it.

There are several factors which create doubts and misgivings in our minds, viz (i) Arguments for and against certain things are conflicting which stand in the way of making clear decisions, e. g. there are doubts regarding lawfulness or unlawfulness of doubtful matter, (ii) learned and research scholars have difference of opinion on any subject, which creates doubts in the minds of common people, (iii) there are some things which are allowed in one way and disallowed in another, which cause some misgivings, e. g. according to some *Aḥādīth* the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has forbidden women to visit tombs, but allowed them in certain cases, (iv) several things are permissible, but owing to some circumstantial evidences they are disallowed, e. g. a certain woman gave evidence that she suckled 'Uqbah bin al-Hārith and his wife, and though 'Uqbah denied the knowledge of it, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) accepted the woman's evidence and instructed 'Uqbah to get rid of his wife. Learned scholars are of the opinion that no evidence regarding suckling can be accepted unless two men or one man and two women bear witness. The Holy Prophet's decision was really the result of the doubt created by that woman's evidence. Similarly, Sa'd bin Waqqāṣ and 'Abd bin Zam'ah presented their case to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), each claiming the guardianship of a certain new-born child. The Apostle of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) decided in favour of 'Abd bin Zam'ah saying, "Child goes to the husband and the adulterer will be deprived of the same." According to the Prophet's decision the said child became brother of Ḥaḍrat Saudah, daughter of Zam'ah (one of the mothers of the Faithful), but he ordered her to observe pardah (veil) with him as the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said that he found some resemblance between the child and 'Atbah. Though resemblance is no sufficient evidence from the religious point of view, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) thought it proper to be cautious. Sometimes it happens that certain things are quite lawful, but some people question their lawfulness on account of misgivings or false charges. Once the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was observing *I'tikāf* in the mosque and Ḥaḍrat Ṣafīyah (one of the mothers of the Faithful) was there. Meanwhile two persons came out of the mosque, and the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) addressing them said: "She is Ṣafīyah". (In this way he desired to remove any possible misgiving from their minds). Thus there are five kinds of *Mushtabahāt* and it is either obligatory or advisable to avoid all of them. The last kind of *Mushtabahāt* is also under the same category, but it is not proper to include it in the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter, because different expressions have been used in the narration of the *Ḥadīth*. This subject has been thoroughly discussed in *Durrul Mukhtār* to which the reader may refer.

Difference between *Mushtabahāt* and *Wasāwis*

The former means doubtful and the latter means whims or sudden turns of mind. The former, as said above, must be abandoned, whereas there is no rhyme and reason to bother about such matters as are creations of one's own whims and fancy. For example, a person hunted an animal in a desert or forest and then thought that this animal might have escaped from the possession of another hunter; or a man has made ablution for prayer but owing to his whim he thinks that his ablution was perhaps finished; or a person suspects as to whether a certain animal has been sacrificed properly or not and whether the name of Allāh was taken or not at the time of sacrifice. All these cases are creations of imagination and have nothing to do with religion. Imām Bukhārī has mentioned two different chapters, i.e., one on abstaining from doubtful matters and the other on difference between doubtful matters and whims." **Ḥāfiẓ** Ibn Taymiyah has written in his *Fatawā* that early Muslims were more cautious about those things which were unlawful for them to earn than about those matters which were disallowed on some minor grounds.

"Which most people do not know", i.e., some لَا يَعْلَمُهَا كَثِيرٌ مِّنَ النَّاسِ people know them but not all of them. This *Ḥadīth* says that whosoever guards himself against doubtful matters protects his religion and position, as under :

To be entangled in doubtful matters فَمَنِ اتَّقَى الْمُشْتَبِهَاتِ اسْتَبْرَأَ لِدِينِهِ وَعِرْضِهِ is harmful from worldly as well as religious points of view. Those persons who do not avoid doubtful things are neither respected at home nor in society, and their religion is also affected adversely; and there is every possibility of their going from bad to worse in future. The first part of the *Ḥadīth* indicates that all lawful and unlawful things are quite evident and the second part points out possibilities of a man going astray, as under.

Whosoever is a victim to وَمَنْ وَقَعَ فِي الشُّبُهَاتِ كَرَاعٍ يَرْعَى حَوْلَ الْحِمَى يُوشِكُ أَنْ يُوَاقِعَهُ doubtful matters is like a shepherd who grazes (his animals) near the meadow (which may be Government property) and may fall therein. Man is here compared to a shepherd and his self to an animal which he grazes. If he does not prevent his animals (i.e. self) from going to the meadow of Allāh, then he (the shepherd) and his self (animal) both will be criminals. Unlawful matters are the meadow of Allāh and the surrounding area is like a doubtful thing. The point of comparison between the two is that just as kings reserve some parts of land for personal or official purposes so also Allāh has reserved some matters for Himself, and the people must keep away from them. Doubtful things are between lawful and unlawful things, and those who will abstain from them will abstain all the more from illegal matters. Thus *Mushtabahāt* are a kind of check. Ibn al-Munīr has described the view of his spiritual guide, Shaykh Abul Qāsim Qabārī as follows :

He says that *Makrūh* (what is detestable) is a check-post between a person and unlawful matters and whoever indulges frequently in detestable things will become victim to unlawful matters also. Similarly, *Mubāḥ* (what is allowed) is a check-post between a person and detestable matters, and whoever crosses the check-post often will commit detestable acts as well. (*Fatḥ al-Bārī*)

إِنَّهُ كَانَ يَقُولُ الْمَكْرُوهُ عَقَبَةٌ بَيْنَ الْعَبْدِ
وَالْحَرَامِ فَمَنِ اسْتَكْثَرَ مِنَ الْمَكْرُوهِ تَطَرَّقَ إِلَى
الْحَرَامِ وَالْمُبَاحُ عَقَبَةٌ بَيْنَهُ وَبَيْنَ الْمَكْرُوهِ
فَمَنِ اسْتَكْثَرَ مِنْهُ تَطَرَّقَ إِلَى الْمَكْرُوهِ. (فتح الباری)

Thus those things which are detestable (neither wholly lawful nor wholly unlawful) are practically *Mushtabahāt*. Hence every person must avoid all kinds of doubtful matters either between a man and lawful matters or between him and detestable things. Shaykh Qabārī's view is supported by the following *Ḥadīth* of Ibn Ḥabbān :

Make lawful things a check-post between yourself and unlawful matters.
(*Fatḥ al-Bārī*, vol. I, p. 118)

اِجْعَلُوا بَيْنَكُمْ وَبَيْنَ الْحَرَامِ سُتْرَةً مِّنَ
الْحَلَالِ (نُقِلَ فی فتح الباری) ج ۱ ص ۱۱۸

أَلَا وَإِنَّ فِي الْجَسَدِ مُضْغَةً

Beware! There is a piece of flesh in body. Apparently this passage does not seem relevant to the previous portion of the *Ḥadīth*. But after careful consideration we realise that there is a very fine and close relationship between the two. Imām Bukhārī said in the beginning that one must avoid all doubtful matters and now he says that the best way of doing so is to reform and improve one's heart which is the centre of all activities. If heart is in good order, i.e., it is filled with fear of Allāh, it will be certainly safe from all doubtful things, whereas if heart goes astray and does not fear Allāh, then every thing will go in vain.

Beware! That piece of flesh is heart. Heart here الا وهی القلب does not really mean that piece of flesh which is in human body. Heart is a seat of emotions and affections, but it is not visible. All internal senses are located in brain though they are not seen in body. One has to scrutinise various parts of brain in order to understand where common sense is sealed and where memory, and so on. Similar is the case of heart. It is not visible in body, but it is fountain-head of the entire physical organisation of life which keeps up circulation by contracting and dilating. If it stops its circulation, the whole administration of body falls through. From religious and spiritual points of view also, all our acts and deeds rest on hearts. If our hearts are good, our work will be good, otherwise not.

Reason is located in heart or brain

The Shāfi'īs and most Muslim scholars of philosophical and scholastic views maintain that reason is located in heart. Ibn Baṭāl says that this point is proved by the *Ḥadīth* under discussion and that whatsoever is found in one's head is also due to heart. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar also endorses this theory. Imām Nawawī writes in his Sharḥi Bukhārī that the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter does not prove whether heart or brain is seat of reason. *Ḥukamā* (philosophers) say that reason is located in brain. Morals i.e. duties of life, are seated in heart. This view is ascribed to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah also. 'Allāmah Qasṭalānī has proved this theory by saying that when brain is out of order, reason also gets out of order.

'Allāmah Syed Anwar Shāh says that the real source of life is heart, but heart and brain are very closely linked. For example, when we press buttons, electric current is completed. Now buttons are like heart and light is like brain. According to this view, there is no need of interpreting the Qur'ānic verses in a peculiar way, and *Ḥukamā* also do not disagree. Ibn Qayyim has discussed this point in his book, *Kitāb al-Rūḥ* and said that *nafs* (life) and *rūḥ* (soul) are almost the same thing. They differ in functions only according to which they are named either *nafṣ* or *rūḥ*, but heart is a different thing altogether. The Holy Qur'ān says:

Lo! therein verily is a reminder for him who hath a heart, or giveth ear with full intelligence. (Qur'ān, 50:37)

إِنَّ فِيْ ذٰلِكَ لَذِكْرٰى لِمَنْ كَانَ لَهٗ قَلْبٌ أَوْ
أَلْقَى السَّمْعَ وَهُوَ شَهِيْدٌ (ق، آیت ۳۷)

Have they not travelled in the land, and have they hearts wherewith to feel? (Qur'ān 22:46)

أَفَلَمْ يَسِيْرُوْا فِي الْأَرْضِ فَتَكُوْنَ لَهُمْ قُلُوْبٌ
يَعْقِلُوْنَ بِهَا (الحج، آیت ۴۶)

This *Ḥadīth* is exceedingly important. Imām Nawawī writes in his *Sharḥi Bukhārī* that this *Ḥadīth* is one of the articles of Islam, and is one of those *Āḥadīth* on which Islam rests. Many scholars say that this *Ḥadīth* sums up one third of principles of Islam, and some say that it comprises one fourth thereof.

CHAPTER XL

To pay one-fifth of the spoils of war (in the way of Allāh) is part of Faith.

51. We have been told by 'Alī bin al-Ja'd who said that he was informed by Shu'bah via :

✵ Abī Jamrah who narrated :

I was sitting with Ibn 'Abbās, as he had asked me to sit on his couch. He then asked me to stay with him so that he could give me a share from his property. I stayed with him for two months. Then he said: "When a delegation of 'Abdul Qays came to the Messenger of Islam (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) he said: "who are the people or who are the delegates"? They replied: "We belong to Rabī'ah". The Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said:

"Welcome ! O people or delegates of 'Abdul Qays! you will neither be disgraced nor grieved " Then they said: "O Messenger of Allāh! We are not in a position to come to you save in the sacred months as the disbelievers of the tribe of Muḍar stand in the way between you and ourselvess: Please instruct us to do such things as are decisive which we convey to our people and which may ensure our entry into Paradise. Further they asked the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) about drinks (or pots in which wine was prepared)" The Messenger of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) directed them to do four things and forbade them four. He commanded them to believe in one Allāh and asked them: "Do you know what is meant by belief in one Allāh?" They said: "Allāh and His Prophet know the best." Then the Prophet said: "It means :

(i) To bear witness that there is no god but Allāh and Muḥammad is the Apostle of Allāh,

بَابٌ 40 أَدَاءُ الْخُمُسِ
مِنَ الْإِيْمَانِ

51- حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ الْجَعْدِ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا شُعْبَةُ
عَنْ أَبِيْ جَمْرَةَ قَالَ كُنْتُ أَقْعُدُ مَعَ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ
فَيُجْلِسُنِيْ عَلٰى سَرِيْرِهٖ فَقَالَ أَقِمْ عِنْدِيْ حَتّٰى
أَجْعَلَ لَكَ سَهْمًا مِّنْ مَّالِيْ فَأَقَمْتُ مَعَهٗ شَهْرَيْنِ
ثُمَّ قَالَ إِنَّ وَفْدَ عَبْدِ الْقَيْسِ لَمَّا أَتَوُا النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى
اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ مَنِ الْقَوْمُ أَوْ مَنِ الْوَفْدُ قَالُوْا
رَبِيْعَةُ قَالَ مَرْحَبًا بِالْقَوْمِ أَوْ بِالْوَفْدِ غَيْرَ خَزَايَا وَلَا
نَدَامٰى فَقَالُوْا يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ إِنَّا لَا نَسْتَطِيْعُ أَنْ نَّأْتِيَكَ
إِلَّا فِي الشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكَ هٰذَا الْحَيُّ مِنْ
كُفَّارِ مُضَرَ فَمُرْنَا بِأَمْرٍ فَصْلٍ نُّخْبِرْ بِهٖ مَنْ وَّرَاءَنَا
وَنَدْخُلْ بِهِ الْجَنَّةَ وَسَأَلُوْهُ عَنِ الْأَشْرِبَةِ
فَأَمَرَهُمْ بِأَرْبَعٍ وَّنَهَاهُمْ عَنْ أَرْبَعٍ أَمَرَهُمْ
بِالْإِيْمَانِ بِاللّٰهِ وَحْدَهٗ قَالَ أَتَدْرُوْنَ مَا الْإِيْمَانُ
بِاللّٰهِ وَحْدَهٗ قَالُوا اللّٰهُ وَرَسُوْلُهٗ أَعْلَمُ قَالَ شَهَادَةُ
أَنْ لَّا إِلٰهَ إِلَّا اللّٰهُ وَأَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ وَإِقَامُ
الصَّلٰوةِ وَإِيْتَاءُ الزَّكٰوةِ وَصِيَامُ رَمَضَانَ وَأَنْ
تُعْطُوْا مِنَ الْمَغْنَمِ الْخُمُسَ وَنَهَاهُمْ عَنْ أَرْبَعٍ
عَنِ الْحَنْتَمِ وَالدُّبَّاءِ وَالنَّقِيْرِ وَالْمُزَفَّتِ وَرُبَّمَا قَالَ
الْمُقَيَّرِ وَقَالَ احْفَظُوْهُنَّ وَأَخْبِرُوْا بِهِنَّ مَنْ وَّرَاءَكُمْ

(ii) to establish prayers, (iii) to pay *zakāt* (poor-due), (iv) to fast during the month of Ramaḍān, (v) and to pay one-fifth of spoils of war in the way of Allāh.

Further, the Apostle of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) forbade them the following four things, (i) Ḥantam (ii) Dubbā' (iii) Naqīr (iv) and Muzaffat (These are the names of the pots in which the 'Arabs generally prepared wines). Then further the Apostle of Allāh said to them to remember them (commandments) and convey them to the people, they left behind, (in their country)."

The spoils of war and the Khumus (one fifth thereof) are described in the following verse of the Qur'ān.

"And know that whatever ye take up as spoils of war, lo! a fifth thereof is for Allāh, and for the messenger and for the kinsman (who hath need) and orphans and the needy and the wayfarer, if ye believe in Allāh." (Qur'ān 8:41)

وَاعْلَمُوْٓا اَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِّنْ شَیْءٍ فَاَنَّ لِلّٰهِ
خُمُسَهٗ وَلِلرَّسُوْلِ وَلِذِی الْقُرْبٰی وَالْیَتٰمٰی وَ
الْمَسٰكِیْنِ وَابْنِ السَّبِیْلِ اِنْ كُنْتُمْ اٰمَنْتُمْ
بِاللّٰهِ (الانفال، آیت ۴۱)

Distinguishing position of the teacher

Abū Jamrah, whose real name was Naṣr bin 'Imrān, belonged to the class of Ḍabī'ah, an offshoot of the tribe of 'Abdul Qays, He was a follower of the Companion of the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

قَالَ كُنْتُ اَقْعُدُ مَعَ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ يُجْلِسُنِىْ عَلٰى سَرِيْرِهٖ

He (Abū Jamrah) said "I was sitting with Ibn 'Abbās who had asked me to sit on his couch." i.e. Ibn 'Abbās was seated on a raised place (like couch) and his pupils were sitting on the ground.

This fact shows that teachers at that time occupied prominent places, such as bench, dias, etc. It is said that Abū Jamrah used to translate Arabic of Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās into Persian. Ibn 'Abbās settled in Baṣrah near Īrān, and many Iranians were his students. As he did not know the Persian language, Abū Jamrah translated his Arabic into Persian for the benefit of Iranian students. It is also said that perhaps Abū Jamrah had a loud voice and he only repeated loudly what his teacher Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās taught, so that the people sitting at a distance could follow his lectures. However, it seems more convincing that Abū Jamrah acted as the translator of his teacher, Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās.

اَقِمْ عِنْدِىْ حَتّٰى اَجْعَلَ لَكَ سَهْمًا مِّنْ مَّالِىْ فَاَقَمْتُ مَعَهٗ شَهْرَيْنِ

He (Ibn 'Abbās) said : 'Stay with me so that I may give you a share of my property'. So I stayed with him for two months.' Now the question is: Abū Jamrah was a pupil of Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās. What was the reason for the latter offering to give part of his property to the former. It is said that it was a wage for Ibn Jamrah's work as translator. (From this it may be inferred that to get remuneration for teaching work is permissible in the religion of Islam). But in the Ḥadīth there is no mention of wage. It is narrated that when Abū Jamrah intended to make Ḥajj, he performed *Tamattu'* according to the advice of Ibn 'Abbās. After Ḥajj he saw in a dream that some one was referring to his Ḥajj as "Ḥajj is good and 'Umrah acceptable".

When he related his dream to Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās, he was very much pleased and said that this was "Sunnati Rasūl", (method of the Holy Prophet) and offered to give him some thing. Shu'bah once asked Abū Jamrah as to why Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās conferred favours on him. He replied that it was due to the dream referred to, above.

ثُمَّ قَالَ إِنَّ وَفْدَ عَبْدِ الْقَيْسِ لَمَّا أَتَوُا النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ مَنِ الْقَوْمُ أَوْ مَنِ الْوَفْدُ قَالُوْا رَبِيْعَةُ

Then he (Ibn 'Abbās) said: When a delegation of tribe of 'Abdul Qays came to the Messenger of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) he said: "Who are the people or whose delegation are they?" They (delegation) said "Rabī'ah". Because Abū Jamrah belonged to the tribe of 'Abdul Qays, Ḥaḍrat Ibn 'Abbās narrated the *Ḥadīth* to him. There might be some other consideration also. It is narrated in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim that a woman asked Ibn 'Abbās about the pots of nabīdh (a kind of wine). In reply he related the above *Ḥadīth* to her.

When did the delegation come to the Messenger of Allāh? Opinions differ. It came either in 6, 8 or 9 A.H. It is also said that the delegation visited the Holy Prophet twice—i.e., in 6 and 8 A.H. The members of the delegation had already embraced Islam and came to the Apostle to learn the teachings of Islam. First he asked them who they were. The tribes of 'Abdul Qays settled in Baḥrayn where Islam reached through Munqidh bin Ḥayān who was a merchant of Baḥrayn but had cloth business at Madīnah. One day the Messenger of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) passed by him and made enquiries about the people of Baḥrayn in general and prominent persons thereof, in particular. Munqidh was surprised as to how the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) knew them without having ever gone to Baḥrayn. He was so much impressed that he accepted Islam immediately and learnt *Sūrah Al-Fātiḥah* and *Sūrah Iqra'*. The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) also enquired about the father-in-law of Munqidh (entitled Ashaj). When he returned home he concealed his Islam for some time but one day his wife told her father that she had found some remarkable changes in Munqidh.

يَغْسِلُ أَطْرَافَهُ وَيَسْتَقْبِلُ الْجِهَةَ فَيَنْحَنِي ظَهْرُهُ مَرَّةً وَيَضَعُ جَبِيْنَهُ مَرَّةً (فتح الملهم شرح صحيح مسلم)

He washed some parts of his body and turning his face to Qiblah, sometimes knelth and sometimes prostrated.

He then ascertained the whole event from Munqidh and accepted Islam. As a result of his preaching, several people of Baḥrayn became Muslim. The delegation of Baḥrayn in 6 A.H. consisted of twelve persons and in 8 A.H., forty. It is not certain which of the two delegations is referred to, here, (vide, *Fatḥul-Mulhim Sharḥi Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* vol 1, P. 181).

"Who are the people or whose delegates are they? The question is who entertained this doubt?—whether Abū Jamrah or transmitters of the *Ḥadīth* below him. It is probable that Shu'bah had the doubt, because the pupils of Abū Jamrah i.e., Qurrah bin Khālid and others also narrated this *Ḥadīth* without any doubt. It is surprising to know that according to Kirmānī, Ibn 'Abbās entertained this doubt.

Rabī'ah and Muḍar were two big tribes of 'Arabia; the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) also belonged to the latter. Nazār bin Ma'd bin 'Adnān had four sons viz. Muḍar, Rabī'ah, Anmār and Zayd. Nazār before his death made a will for division of his property among his sons, of whom Muḍar obtained gold and Rabī'ah horses. Therefore the former was known as "Muḍar al-Ḥamrā'" and the latter as "Rabī'at al Faras". These two sons were well-known and their tribes were prominent. 'Abdul Qays was a branch of the tribes of Rabī'ah.

قَالَ مَرْحَبًا بِالْقَوْمِ أَوْ بِالْوَفْدِ غَيْرَ خَزَايَا وَلَا نَدَامٰى

The Messenger of Allāh

(صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) welcomed the people or delegation, "Neither to be disgraced nor to be repentant". The word "Marḥabā" is derived from 'Raḥb' which means to make room, i.e., the member of delegation will be accommodated comfortably.[1]

The Messenger of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) by his precepts and practices taught the Muslims to be kind and considerate to guests and visitors. The word "خزایا" (Khazāyā) is plural of "خزیان" (Khazyān) which means disgraced and the word "ندامیٰ" (Nadāmā) meaning repentant is used here as plural of "نادم" (Nādim) against the rules of 'Arabic grammar, for the sake of rhyme like al-'Ashāyā wal-Ghadāyā" (though the plural of Ghadāt is Ghadawāt, not Ghadāyā). Jauhārī, Qazzār and some others are of the opinion that "Nadāmā" is plural of Nadmān which literally means repentant.[2]

فَقَالُوْا يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ إِنَّا لَا نَسْتَطِيْعُ أَنْ نَأْتِيَكَ إِلَّا فِي الشَّهْرِ الْحَرَامِ

They said! O Messenger of Allah! (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) We cannot come to you save in the forbidden months. Forbidden months are Dhil Qa'dah, Dhil Ḥajjah, Muḥarram and Rajab during which all kinds of fighting and bloodshed were forbidden. The delegates might have intended all of the four months. This view is supported by Qatādah's *Ḥadīth* mentioned in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim in the chapter on the pillars of Islam i.e., "لانقدر علیک الافی اشهرالحرم" (We cannot come to you but in forbidden months). Imām Bukhārī has also narrated Qurrah's *Ḥadīth* in which "Ashhur" the plural number of "Shahr" (meaning month) is used i.e., "لانصل الیک الافی اشهرالحرم" (we cannot visit you but in forbidden months, vide chapter on delegation of 'Abdul Qays). It is possible that the delegates in reply to the Holy Prophet might have meant the month of Rajab only and hence used the singular number (i.e., Shahr meaning month). This view is endorsed by a *Ḥadīth* narrated by Bayhaqī. As the tribe of Muḍar held the month of Rajab in the highest esteem, "Rajabu Muḍar was used in the *Ḥadīth* of Abū Bakrah—though they honoured all the four forbidden months including the month of Rajab. As the Muḍar were engaged in wars with certain tribes, the delegates told the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) that they could not go to him (the Prophet) easily and frequently. They, therefore, requested him to teach them principles of Islam in a concise and decisive manner so that they could easily act on them and convey them to their people at home. The delegates had already accepted Islam, and, therefore, addressed the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) as Muslims generally did. The polytheists addressed him by name and the Peoples of the Book by "Abul Qāsim".

أَمَرَهُمْ بِالْإِيْمَانِ بِاللّٰهِ وَحْدَهُ

The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) commanded the delegates to believe in one Allāh. They were Muslims already but in order to stress the importance of unity of Allāh, the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) told them to testify that Allāh is one and one alone. The Holy Qur'ān says: "O Believers! believe in Allāh and His Apostle". (Qur'ān, 4:136)

---

[1] i.e., the delegates will be housed decently and entertained properly so that they will feel at home here. The guests will never think themselves strangers in a new place. They will befriend the host and find him always kind and affectionate. [2] Nisā'ī has narrated Marḥabā bilwafdi etc. etc. Ibn Abī Jamrah said that he (Apostle of Allāh) welcomed them with good news for the present as well as for the future.

'Abdur Raḥmān

Four or five things

In the beginning of the *Ḥadīth* four things were mentioned, whereas towards the end of it five things were named, viz., *Īmān*, prayers, poor-due, fast and Khumus (one-fifth of the war-booty). Several explanations have been given, as under:—

(i) Bayḍāwī writes in his Sharḥi Maṣābīḥ that out of four promised items only one has been mentioned here, because all the five things are included in Belief, in the unity of Allāh. This explanation favours the view of Imām Bukhārī also. He has included the five aforesaid items in Belief and, his chapter "اداء الخمس من الايمان" (i.e., payment of one-fifth of the war booty is part of Faith) also supports it. It is also endorsed by Bukhārī's assertion in the *Ḥadīth* of Jibra'īl (Gabriel) that what the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said to the delegation of 'Abdul Qays (viz., testifying that Allāh is one and Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad is His Apostle, offering prayers, paying zakāt, fasting during the month of Ramaḍān) is a part of *Īmān* (Faith).

There is some objection to this explanation, viz., of the four promised things three (prayers, poor-due, fast) have been omitted without any justification. Bayḍāwī says that the transmitters of the *Ḥadīth* omitted them either by mistake or by way of abridging the *Ḥadīth*. But the reply is hardly convincing and it seems very unlikely that not a single transmitter could reproduce in full what the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said. Moreover, Imām Bukhārī and majority of Muḥaddithīn (Traditionists) hold that all human deeds are parts of the Faith. Now the question is why should we confine our deeds to the aforesaid four things only? There are many other acts also, and all of them must be considered as parts of *Īmān* according to the theory of Bukhārī and other scholars holding the same view.

(ii) Bayḍāwī gives another reply, viz., the four promised items are prayers, zakāt (poor-due), fast and payment of one-fifth of war booty; whereas Kalima'i Shahādat is mentioned by way of sanctity and blessings. The Holy Qur'ān says, "And know that whatever ye take as spoils of war, lo! a fifth thereof is for Allāh, and for the Messenger" (8:41). Here also the commentators of the Qur'ān say that Allāh has been mentioned by way of sanctity and blessings. It is also said that the delegates who had already embraced Islam knew that belief in Allāh and His Apostles was essential. They sometimes thought that belief was all in all and no work was necessary. Hence details of *Īmān* were described in the said *Ḥadīth*. But this reply also does not seem correct, because in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (chapter on Articles of Faith) there is a *Ḥadīth*, narrated by Ḥammād bin Zayd, via Abū Jamrah, to the effect, "I order you to do four things and forbid four things, viz., Belief in Allāh—then he detailed it by adding, to bear witness that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is His slave and Apostle". There is another version of the *Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* in which Khalaf was mentioned, "There is no god but Allāh only." This clearly shows that *Īmān* in Allāh, which was mentioned as Kalimah Shahādat, was one of the four items.

(iii) The third reply is that Belief in Allāh (considered as equal to Kalimah Shahādat) is one item and other three items are prayers, zakāt (poor-due) and fast. Payment of one-fifth of war-booty is something additional. To bestow more than what is promised is not objectionable. The Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) first promised four things to the delegation and later realised that they were at war with the Muḍar tribe and it would be proper to enlighten them on the subject of distribution of the spoils of war also.

(iv) The fourth reply is that payment of Khumus one-fifth of (war-booty) is a branch of zakāt and hence it is not a separate item.

(v) The fifth reply is given by Ibn Ṣalāh, i.e., the Holy Prophet ordered them (ordered you) to do four things, and pay *Khumus*. So *Khumus* is connected (by letter of conjunction), with all the four things and not with any one of them exclusively.

Of these five replies, the first endorses the subject-matter of the chapter mentioned by Imām Bukhārī and also what is said in the chapter of *Ḥadīth-i-Jibra'īl* (i. e., what the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said to the delegates of 'Abdul Qays), but this reply is not correct as stated above. The second reply is not correct either. The best reply is the third. The fourth and fifth replies may be accepted but they do not support either of the two points of Imām Bukhārī viz. the subject-matter of the chapter and the purpose of *Ḥadīthi-Jibra'īl*, because these replies do not specify whether payment of Khumus, prayers, poor-due and fasting, etc, are details or parts of Īmān (or they were separate items altogether like Īmān). It is possible that Bukhārī meant what Bayḍāwī said here.

'Allamah Sindhi's explanation of the controversial points

'Allāmah Sindhī's explanation of the above points is summed up as follows: If a thing is composed of several parts, it can be referred to, in the singular number; when the thing is collectively mentioned and in the plural number then its different parts are described, e. g., مجموعه رسائل ابن تيميه and مجموعه رسائل ابن عابدين. Each of such collection of books may be treated as one book (because it is a collection of several parts) and as several books also in consideration of its several parts. Similarly, Īmān (Faith) is composed of several things, viz confirmation, confession and work, and work includes prayers, zakāt (poor-due), fasting and payment of Khumus (one-fifth of the spoils of war). Now Īmān, taken as an aggregate of units, is one thing, but in consideration of its several units it is numerous. Imām Bukhārī treated Īmān as an aggregate of units in the above-mentioned *Ḥadīth* and pointed to it in the *Ḥadīth-i-Jibra'īl*. As Īmān is composed of several items, Bukhārī described them separately also. All these items, prayers, poor-dues, fasting etc. are details of Īmān. Bayḍāwī's statement that all these items are included in Īmān and three of the four times are not mentioned in the *Ḥadīth* is not correct. As a matter of fact, all these itmes are details of Īmān. In short, 'Allāmah Sindhī's explanation favours the view of Imām Bukhārī.

Why is *Ḥajj* not included in the *Ḥadīth*?

Ḥajj is one of the five articles of the religion of Islam. Why is it not mentioned in the *Ḥadīth* under discussion? This question is answered in several ways, as under :

(i) The delegation of 'Abdul Qays came to Madīnah in 6 A. H. (or 8 A. H.) and *Hajj* was made obligatory in 9 A. H.

(ii) The delegation had visited Madīnah in 9 A. H. but before Ḥajj was made one of the Articles of Faith.

(iii) Supposing that the delegation met the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) after Ḥajj had been made obligatory, the *Ḥadīth* did not include Ḥajj for some considerations. Firstly, it was impossible for the tribe of 'Abdul Qays to make Ḥajj on account of the hostility of the disbelievers of the tribe of Muḍar. Secondly, Ḥajj is not obligatory for every Muslim like prayers, fasting etc. Thirdly, Ḥajj is obligatory once in life only, unlike prayers, fasting etc. which are obligatory throughout life.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has narrated some Aḥādīth from Bayhaqī, which include Ḥajj also, but he has described them as weak. If they are correct, the number of items (included in the *Ḥadīth*) will be six, not five and the difficulty may be solved in the light of what is said above.

And the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) forbade وَنَهَاهُمْ عَنْ أَرْبَعٍ them four things, viz. Ḥantam, Dubbā', Naqīr and Muzaffat. These were the names of the pots in which the 'Arabs used to prepare alcoholic drinks in the pre-Islamic period. In the beginning when wine was declared unlawful the use of the above-named pots was also banned. This precautionary step was adopted in order to persuade the Muslims to get rid of the habit of drinking at an early date. Afterwards, when they fully appreciated the teachings of Islam and realised the injurious effects of drinking, the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) lifted the ban on the use of the pots in which wine was prepared according to a *Ḥadīth* of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim.

Relevancy and object of the *Ḥadīth*

In the preceding *Ḥadīth* it was said that the person who avoided doubtful matters and saved his religion and honour, was really a sincere Muslim. In this *Ḥadīth* Imām Bukhārī intends to say that the delegates of the tribe of 'Abdul Qays were sincere Muslims, because they visited the Apostle of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in order to learn from him the teachings of Islam, which could ensure their salvation in this world and the next.

CHAPTER XLI

Regarding the *Ḥadīth* "All deeds are based on motives (intentions) and sincerity. Every person will get what he intends to get. And *Imān*, ablution, prayers, *Zakāt* (poor-dues) *Ḥajj*, fasting and other commandments are included therein.

Allāh, the Most Exalted, says: "Say: (O Muḥammad!) Each one doth according to his rule of conduct. (Qur'ān 17:84)

And if a person spends some things on his family with a view to obtaining rewards from Allāh, his expenditure will be an act of charity (giving alms). And the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said: "But Jihād and motive." i. e. after conquest of Makkah there will be no Hijrat (Emigration) but Jihād and good intentions will remain.

بَابٌ [41] مَا جَاءَ أَنَّ الْأَعْمَالَ بِالنِّيَّةِ وَ
الْحِسْبَةِ وَلِكُلِّ امْرِءٍ مَّا نَوٰى فَدَخَلَ فِيْهِ
الْإِيْمَانُ وَالْوُضُوْءُ وَالصَّلٰوةُ وَالزَّكٰوةُ وَالْحَجُّ وَ
الصَّوْمُ وَالْأَحْكَامُ وَقَالَ اللهُ تَعَالٰى قُلْ كُلٌّ يَّعْمَلُ
عَلٰى شَاكِلَتِهٖ عَلٰى نِيَّتِهٖ نَفَقَةُ الرَّجُلِ عَلٰى أَهْلِهٖ
يَحْتَسِبُهَا صَدَقَةٌ وَّقَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ وَلٰكِنْ جِهَادٌ وَّنِيَّةٌ ❊

52. We have been told by 'Abdullah bin Maslamah who said that he was informed by Mālik via Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd via Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm via 'Alqamah bin Waqqāṣ that :

✱ Haḍrat 'Umar narrated:

The Apostle of Allāh said: All deeds are based on motives (intentions) and every person will get what he intends to get. So if a person emigrates for Allāh and His Apostle, his emigration would be treated for Allāh and His Apostle. And if a person emigrates for wordly affairs or for a woman whom he marries his emigration is for that to which he emigrates.

53. We have been told by Ḥajjāj bin Minhāl who said that he was informed by Shu'bah who said: 'Adī bin Thābit told me that he heard 'Abdullāh bin Yazīd, via:

✱Abū Mas'ūd that the latter narrated:

The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'ālaihi wa sallam*) said: When a person spends something on his family in order to get rewards from Allāh, his expenditure will be an act of charity (giving-alms).

54. We have been told by al-Ḥakam bin Nāfi' who said that he was informed by Shu'ayb via Zuhrī who said: 'Āmir bin Sa'd told us that :

✱ Sa'd bin Waqqāṣ narrated :

The Holy Apostle (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) said : "Indeed you will be rewarded for whatever you spend in order to obtain pleasure of Allāh, including the morsel which you put in the mouth of your wife."

52. حدثنا عبد الله بن مسلمة قال أخبرنا مالك عن يحيى بن سعيد عن محمد بن إبراهيم عن علقمة بن وقاص عن عمر أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال الأعمال بالنية ولكل امرئ ما نوى فمن كانت هجرته إلى الله ورسوله فهجرته إلى الله ورسوله ومن كانت هجرته لدنيا يصيبها أو امرأة يتزوجها فهجرته إلى ما هاجر إليه ؛

53. حدثنا حجاج ابن منهال قال حدثنا شعبة قال أخبرني عدي بن ثابت قال سمعت عبد الله بن يزيد عن أبي مسعود عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال إذا أنفق الرجل على أهله يحتسبها فهي له صدقة ؛

54. حدثنا الحكم بن نافع قال أخبرنا شعيب عن الزهري قال حدثني عامر بن سعد عن سعد بن أبي وقاص أنه أخبره أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال إنك لن تنفق نفقة تبتغي بها وجه الله إلا أجرت عليها حتى ما تجعل في فم امرأتك ؛

Relevancy and object of *Ḥadīth*

After having previously described Īmān, good work, chastity and other matters relating to Īmān, Bukhārī says in this chapter that all good deeds including Īmān depend on good motives (intentions). They can be accepted only if the doers are actuated by good intentions. The word الحسبة in the *Ḥadīth* means seeking rewards from Allāh, i. e., one must believe and do good deeds with good motives in order to obtain favours of Allāh for what one does : This point has already been discussed before. The third explanation is: لكل امرى مانوى (Everyone gets what he intends to get).

Imām Bukhārī describes here three *Aḥādīth* of which the first is in support of the first and last subject-matter and word الحسبة in the second *Ḥadīth* indicates that it is really the explanation of good motive.

فدخل فيه الإيمان والوضوء والصلوة والزكوة والحج والصوم والأحكام

Īmān, ablution, prayers, poor-due, *Ḥajj* and Fast and other Islamic injunctions are included in the terms "Nīyat" (intention) Imām Bukhārī perhaps means to say that mere confession by tongue is not sufficient for Īmān, and conviction of heart is essential for it. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says, Bukhārī's theory that intention is included in Īmān is justified on the assumption that Īmān is also an 'amal (work), as stated earlier. But that Īmān which means conviction of heart does not need intention "as other deeds need it".

Imām Bukhārī treats *Īmān* as an *'Amal* (work), so he holds that it must have motive like other deeds. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that Īmān in the sense of conviction of heart does not require motives like devotion to Allāh and love for them, because such sentiments are exclusively reserved for the Divine Being.

Further, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that motive (or intention) really differentiates between the acts exclusively meant for Allāh and the acts, which are intended for other than Allāh or it distinguishes between good deeds of various grades i. e. between obligatory and voluntary actions or between 'Ibādat' (worship) and 'Ādat' (habit) Vide *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, Vol. 1 page 144.

In my opinion Īmān in the sense of conviction of heart is an act of heart and this is volitional, as discussed earlier. Though motive is not necessary for the validity of an action, it is substantially improved when it is actuated by good intentions. The Holy Qur'ān says :

وَإِذَا سَمِعُوا مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَى الرَّسُولِ تَرَىٰ
أَعْيُنَهُمْ تَفِيضُ مِنَ الدَّمْعِ مِمَّا عَرَفُوا مِنَ الْحَقِّ

When they listen to that which hath been revealed unto the Messenger, thou seest their eyes overflow with tears because of their recognition of the Truth.
(Qur'ān 5:83)

Imām Bukhārī has generalised his theory. It should be specified to some extent, as discussed in the commentary on the *Ḥadīth* انما الاعمال بالنيات (Indeed all deeds are based on intentions (or motives). Otherwise intention will be needed for intentions also, because "*Nīyat*" (intention) is also an action, and it will go on indefinitely. The Ḥanafīs hold that intention is not necessary for the validity of an act but it is essential for its rewards. They also say that if ablution is intended for prayers intention is necessary. The author of "*al-Ashbāhu wal Naẓā'ir*" has discussed the point, i. e., on what occasions intention is necessary and on what occasion it is not necessary according to the Ḥanafīs.

قَالَ اللّٰهُ تَعَالٰى قُلْ كُلٌّ يَعْمَلُ عَلٰى شَاكِلَتِهِ عَلٰى نِيَّتِهِ

Allāh, the Most Exalted, said "Say (O Prophet): Each one doth according to his rule of conduct. (Qur'ān 17:84)

Ḥasan Baṣarī, Mu'āwiyah bin Qurrat al-Muznī and Qatādah have interpreted the word "*Shākilat*" as motive (or intention). Ṭabarī and a few others have also mentioned it. Some scholars say that this word means something inherent. In other words, what is in one's heart will come to pass (or what is contained in the pot will come out). According to the commentators of the Qur'ān this verse means that every person works in accordance with his natural tendency and mental inclination. The last portion of the verse, "And thy Lord is best aware of him whose way is right" (17:84) favours this view.

وَنَفَقَةُ الرَّجُلِ عَلٰى أَهْلِهِ يَحْتَسِبُهَا صَدَقَةٌ

Whatever one spends on one's family in order to get rewards (from Allāh) is an act of charity.

وَلٰكِنْ جِهَادٌ وَنِيَّةٌ

After the conquest of Makkah the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) announced "Hijrat (emigration to Madīnah) is now discontinued, but Jihād and intentions remain"—this is a part of the *Ḥadīth*. A certain person after the conquest (of Makkah) requested the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) to accept his Hijrat, but he replied: "There is no emigration but Jihād and good intention remain."

Imām Bukhārī has narrated this *Ḥadīth* in the chapter on, "There is no emigration after the conquest (of Makkah)" and now likes to prove his theory that the well-known emigration from Makkah to Madīnah was discontinued because Makkah itself had become a centre of the religion of Islam. Of course, *Jihād* continues as a means of obtaining favourable position here as well as in the Hereafter; and if *Jihād* is not possible now one must have intention to join it in future and when it is practicable. Some scholars are of the opinion that '*Nīyat*' (motive or intention) here applies to all kinds of good work. It is also possible that by "*Nīyat*" intention for *Hijrat* (emigration) in general is meant here, i. e., in future if circumstances compel a person to make *Hijrat* from one place to another, he may be ready for it.

CHAPTER XLII

The Saying of the Messenger of Allāh : (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) "Religion means obedience to Allāh, His Messenger and Muslim rulers from the depth of hearts and sincerity and kindness to the Muslim community in general, as Allāh, the Most Exalted, says :

"If they are true to Allāh and His Messenger." (Qur'ān 9:91)

55. We have been told by Musaddad who said that he was informed by Yaḥyā via Ismā'īl who said: Qays bin Abī Ḥāzim told me via :

✱ Jarīr bin 'Abdullah al-Bajalī that he (the latter) said :

I took Bay'at i.e. I took an oath of allegiance to the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) for establishing prayers, paying *Zakāt* (poor-due) and being a well-wisher of every Muslim.

56. We have been told by 'Abul Nu'mān who said that he was informed by Abū 'Awānah via Ziyād bin 'Ilāqah that he (latter) heard,

✱ Jarīr bin 'Abdullāh say on the day when Mughīrah bin Shu'bah died. He (Jarīr) stood on the pulpit and first praised and thanked Allāh and then said:

"Fear Allāh alone Who has no partner. Be calm and peaceful until your new Amīr (Governor) comes to you and he will come soon." Then he further said: Beg Allāh's forgiveness for your (deceased) Amīr because he loved forgiving the people. Afterwards he said: I went to the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) and told him 'I desire to take an oath of allegiance to you for Islam.' The Prophet then made the condition that I must be sincere to every Muslim. I took Bay'at to him accordingly: "And by the Lord of this mosque I am sincere to you all". Then he (Jarīr) begged Allāh's pardon and got down the pulpit.

بَابٌ 42 قَوْلِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
الدِّينُ النَّصِيحَةُ لِلّٰهِ وَلِرَسُولِهِ وَلِأَئِمَّةِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ
وَعَامَّتِهِمْ وَقَوْلِهِ تَعَالٰى إِذَا نَصَحُوا لِلّٰهِ وَرَسُولِهِ ؛

55 ۔ حَدَّثَنَا مُسَدَّدٌ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيٰى عَنْ
إِسْمٰعِيلَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي قَيْسُ بْنُ أَبِي حَازِمٍ عَنْ
جَرِيرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللهِ الْبَجَلِيِّ قَالَ بَايَعْتُ رَسُولَ اللهِ
صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَلٰى إِقَامِ الصَّلٰوةِ وَإِيتَاءِ
الزَّكٰوةِ وَالنُّصْحِ لِكُلِّ مُسْلِمٍ ؛

56 ۔ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو النُّعْمَانِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو
عَوَانَةَ عَنْ زِيَادِ بْنِ عِلَاقَةَ قَالَ سَمِعْتُ جَرِيرَ
بْنَ عَبْدِ اللهِ يَوْمَ مَاتَ الْمُغِيرَةُ بْنُ شُعْبَةَ قَامَ
فَحَمِدَ اللهَ وَأَثْنٰى عَلَيْهِ وَقَالَ عَلَيْكُمْ بِاتِّقَاءِ
اللهِ وَحْدَهُ لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُ وَالْوَقَارِ وَالسَّكِينَةِ
حَتّٰى يَأْتِيَكُمْ أَمِيرٌ فَإِنَّمَا يَأْتِيكُمُ الْآنَ ثُمَّ قَالَ
اسْتَعْفُوا لِأَمِيرِكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ كَانَ يُحِبُّ الْعَفْوَ ثُمَّ
قَالَ أَمَّا بَعْدُ فَإِنِّي أَتَيْتُ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ قُلْتُ أُبَايِعُكَ عَلَى الْإِسْلَامِ فَشَرَطَ عَلَيَّ وَ
النُّصْحِ لِكُلِّ مُسْلِمٍ فَبَايَعْتُهُ عَلٰى هٰذَا وَرَبِّ
هٰذَا الْمَسْجِدِ إِنِّي لَنَاصِحٌ لَكُمْ ثُمَّ اسْتَغْفَرَ
وَنَزَلَ ؛

Imām Bukhārī has narrated here two *Aḥādīth*. As the first *Ḥadīth* did not fulfil his conditions, he made it part of the subject-matter, and added another *Ḥadīth*. The main purpose of the Imām is to stress the point that we must treat all Muslims with sincerity and affection, and this is part of the religion of Islam. As stated earlier, Dīn (religion) and Īmān (Faith) are synonymous terms. Similarly, sincerity and Īmān are also closely related. As sincerity has various grades so also Īmān (Faith) has. Thus the first and last parts of "Kitāb al-Īmān" (Book of Faith) of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī are inter-linked.

الدِّينُ النَّصِيحَةُ لِلّٰهِ وَلِرَسُولِهِ وَلِأَئِمَّةِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَعَامَّتِهِمْ

The Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) says that Islam signifies sincerity towards Allāh and His Apostle and Muslim rulers and all people in general. This *Ḥadīth* has an encyclopaedic import among the Collection of words of the Prophet. Learned scholars maintain that had this *Ḥadīth* alone remained extant out of thousands of *Ahādīth* of the Apostle of Allāh, it would have been sufficient for the guidance of mankind. The words *Dīn* (religion) and *al-Naṣīḥat* (sincerity) have both definite articles here, and this proves that religion consists in sincerity.

The meaning of Nasihat

According to 'Arabic lexicon the word *Naṣīhāt* has two meanings (i) to clean and purify, i. e., to get rid of all undesirable elements and make a thing neat and clean. There is an 'Arabic idiom نصحت العسل which means that I have made honey pure removing all rubbish things which were mixed therewith, and (ii) to unite (or link) scattered parts together. There is an 'Arabic idiom نصحت الثوب which means that I have stitched together torn pieces of cloth. A man's sincerity towards another combines both these points.

Sincerity towards Allāh means that we must believe from the depth of heart that Allāh is one, Who is endowed with all attributes of perfection; we must not make any one share the worship due to Him alone and we must not ascribe any thing to Him which is below His dignity. Sincerity towards the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) signifies that we must believe in him from the core of heart and obey him in all cases and sacrifice our lives and property in support of him. والنصح لائمة المسلمين in the *Ḥadīth* many include those persons who are distinguished in Islamic learning and have capacity to guide the people on the straight path and also those persons who are cultured and are prominent in the field of politics. We must be sincere to both the types of our leaders in all spiritual and secular affairs to the best of our capacity. Sincerity towards the Muslim community in general is that we must treat them with sympathy and kindness.

عَنْ جَرِيرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ قَالَ بَايَعْتُ رَسُولَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

Jarīr bin 'Abdullāh al-Bajalī narrates that he took an oath of allegiance to the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Jarīr embraced Islam six months before the Prophet's demise. He was very handsome, and the Prophet smiled when he looked at him. For this reason he was entitled as "Joseph of the Muslim community"; Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ says that in the *Ḥadīth*, prayers and zakāt (poor-due) are only mentioned because of their being well-known. Fasting and other Islamic injunctions were included in the general expression, "Listen and obey". Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib says that Imām Bukhārī has added this expression in his *Kitāb al-Buyū'* following the style of Abū Sufyān.

Ṭabarānī narrates that a slave of Jarīr purchased a horse for 300- but he thought that it was very cheap and therefore went to the owner of the horse and paid him 800.

Qurṭabī says that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) accepted Bay'at of the Believers, sometimes for the renewal of the previous allegiance and sometimes for stressing certain important points.

I said to the Apostle قلت أبايعك على الإسلام فشرط علي والنصح لكل مسلم فبايعته على هذا of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "I like to take an oath of allegiance to you." He made the condition that I must be sincere towards Islam and every Musalman. Then I took Bay'at accordingly.

Jarīr relates here another event. Mughīrah bin Shu'bah, Governor of Kūfah, during the reign of Amīr Mu'āwiyah, died. It is said that before his death he nominated Jarīr as his deputy, but it is not certain because Ḥafiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says in his book *Fatḥ al-Bārī* Mughīrah before his death nominated his son 'Urwah his deputy, and it is also said that he made Jarīr as his deputy. Anyhow, Jarīr advised the people to be calm and quiet and wait for the arrival of a new Governor of Kūfah. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says, when Mu'āwiyah got the news of Mughīrah's death, he wrote to Ziyād, the then Governor of Baṣrah, to proceed to Kūfah as Governor thereof. Ḥaḍrat Jarīr in course of his speech requested the people to beg Allāh's forgiveness for Mughīrah and added that he also used to forgive the people. It was in the interest of the Muslims in general that Jarīr narrated this *Ḥadīth* of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

We thank God that after *Kitāb al-Waḥī*, we have finished the translation of the Chapters of *Kitāb al-Īmān*. We pray to God that the readers may find it easy to read and comprehend it.

Imām Bukhārī has written *Kitāb al-'Ilm* after it.

After perfect belief and faith in our real Lord, the Almighty God, it is necessary to know His likes and dislikes. Without the knowledge of these, a man cannot observe His commandments. That is why Imām Bukhārī has written *Kitāb al-'Ilm* just after *Kitāb al-Īmān*.

(The Book of Knowledge)

In the name of Allāh, who is Excessively Compassionate, Extremely Merciful.

CHAPTER XLIII

Excellence of knowledege and Allāh's saying : Allāh will exalt those who believe among you, and those who have knowledge, to high ranks. Allāh is informed of what ye do." (Qur'ān 58:11)

And Allāh's statement, Say: My Lord! Increase me in kuowledge. (Qur'ān 20:114)

كِتَابُ الْعِلْمِ

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

بَابُ 43 فَضْلِ الْعِلْمِ وَقَوْلِ اللّٰهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

يَرْفَعِ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَالَّذِيْنَ اُوْتُوا الْعِلْمَ

دَرَجٰتٍ وَاللّٰهُ بِمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ خَبِيْرٌ وَقَوْلِهٖ رَبِّ زِدْنِيْ عِلْمًا

Relevancy of The Book of Knowledge and The Book of Faith

Imām Bukhārī began his book with a short account of *Waḥī* (Divine Inspiration), because all Islamic beliefs, tenets, injunctions and other spiritual and temporal matters are based on *Waḥī*; and according to the religion of Islam those things are only accepted as true which are proved directly or indirectly by Waḥī (Divine Inspiration). Afterwards Imām Bukhārī described *Īmān* (Faith) and matters relating thereto because *Īmān* is the fountain-head of all our actions. The pre-requisite for the acceptance of our deeds is *Īmān*. However, excellent an action may otherwise be, it will be rejected if it is not preceded by Belief in Allāh and His Apostle. Belief in Allāh and His Prophet involves complete obedience to them, and this is not possible without knowing what their commandments and prohibitions are and what actions are rewardable and what are punishable. Hence the importance and utility of acquiring knowledge cannot be over emphasised. It is every body's duty to obtain knowledge as far as practicable. Imām Bukhārī has therefore described the excellence of knowledge after relating the essentials of *Īmān*; Allāh says :

Allāh will exalt those who believe among you, and those who have knowledge, to high ranks. (Qur'ān 58:11)

يَرْفَعِ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَالَّذِيْنَ اُوْتُوا

الْعِلْمَ دَرَجٰتٍ (مجادلہ، آیت ١١)

What is 'Ilm (Knowledge)

I shall first relate what *'Ilm* is and then describe its excellence. The word *'Ilm* literally means to know. But technically it has been described in 14 or 15 ways, and it is very difficult to say which is the most appropriate. A few scholars say that it is impossible to define *'Ilm* accurately, and others say that it is not impossible but extremely difficult. Anyhow, Mīr Syed Sharīf's definition of *'Ilm* is the best of the lot. He says that *'Ilm* (Knowledge) is a quality which enlightens that thing with which it is linked. In other words *'Ilm* (knowledge) is a quality of *'Aql* (reason) or an action thereof. So it is essential to ascertain what *'Aql* is so that the meaning of *'Ilm* can be easily understood.

To understand *'Ilm* depends on our understanding of *'Aql*

'Aql (reason or intellect) has been variously defined. Imām Ghazzālī has described *'Aql* as follows :

"*'Aql* is a natural (or instinctive) impulse of a man through which he accepts theoretical sciences." Ḥārith bin Asad Muḥāsibī has ex-

explained it in these words: "As if it (*'Aql*) is light which is infused in man's heart through which things are manifested."

'Ilm has the same relationship with *'Aql* which "Sight" has with eyes i. e. *'Aql* is really like eyes, and their action is called 'sight' (which is a quality inherent in eyes). Similarly, the action of *'Aql* (reason) is called *'Ilm* (knowledge), which is also called a quality of *'Aql*.

'Aql (Reason) and Shari'at (Islam)

In respect of theological sciences, Islam has the same relationship with reason as sunlight with our eyes. Just as without external light our eyes are helpless, so also without the aid of *Sharī'at* (Islam) our reason or intellect is quite ineffective. Hence when the external light i. e. religion (of Islam) is linked with the internal light of heart (i. e. reason) the sum-total is what is really meant by *'Ilm* (knowledge). It is this *'Ilm* (knowledge) which is praised by Allāh and His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم).

It should be borne in mind that every person has reason (or intellect) by nature. But in the beginning every natural or instinctive impulse is dim and dark which gradually rises to higher grade or rank, e. g. at the break of dawn there is dim light, but slowly and steadily it goes on increasing until the entire atmosphere is brightened. Similarly, a child at the time of its birth has very weak intellect which in course of time becomes formidable. Afterwards regular study, research works, experiences, observations and experiments go a long way in developing one's reason and intellect. Imām Ghazzālī has discussed this subject in detail in his book *Iḥyā' al-'Ulūm* (Chapter on knowledge).

In short 'Ilm (Knowledge) means enlightenment, which is obtained through *'Aql* (reason); and this is a natural impulse. Again reason without the aid of religion is helpless as our eyes are without external light. It cannot be gainsaid that it is *Sharī'at* (religion) which tells us what beliefs, actions, social, economic, moral and political matters, etc. are commendable and what are condemnable. For example, if lots of eatable things are placed before me, and if I ask philosophers, logicians and others to tell me which of these eatables is the most delicious for me, they will not be able to reply correctly until I tell them myself. Hence it is Allāh alone who differentiates between lawful and unlawful, good and bad things, and none else. It is evident that Allāh Himself will not go to everybody to tell him that such actions are praiseworthy and such are blamable. Hence He has been pleased to send His Apostles to mankind from time to time to guide them on the right path and tell them what deeds are good and what are bad.

Excellence of Knowledge

Of all the created beings, man is certainly the best and noblest (*Ashraf al-Makhlūqāt*). There are several reasons for this dignified position of man. The chief reason is that, despite the fact that some created beings were apparently stronger or better than man, he was chosen as vicegerent (Caliph) of Allāh. He says :

Lo! I am about to place a viceroy in the earth. (Qur'ān 2:30)

اِنِّیْ جَاعِلٌ فِی الْاَرْضِ خَلِیْفَةً (بقرہ، آیت ۳۰)

Then the angels presented before Allāh, their distinction and excellence in action, in comparison to Ādam:

While we hymn Thy praise and sanctify Thee. (Qur'ān 2:30)

وَنَحْنُ نُسَبِّحُ بِحَمْدِكَ وَنُقَدِّسُ لَكَ (بقرہ آیت ۳۰)

The angels further referred to the fighting nature of others than themselves in this way:

They said: Wilt Thou place therein one who will do harm and will shed blood. (Qur'ān 2:30)

أَتَجْعَلُ فِيْهَا مَنْ يُّفْسِدُ فِيْهَا وَيَسْفِكُ الدِّمَآءَ ج (بقرہ، آیت ۳۰)

Then Allāh briefly said :

Surely I know that which ye know not." (Qur'ān 2:30)

إِنِّيْ أَعْلَمُ مَا لَا تَعْلَمُوْنَ۔ (بقرہ، آیت ۳۰)

When competition took place between Ḥaḍrat Ādam (may peace be on him) and angels, Allāh endowed the former with knowledge, superior to that of the angels as under: "And He taught Ādam all the names, then showed them to the angels, saying: Inform Me of the names of these, if ye are truthful". (Qur'ān, 2:31)

It is, therefore, obvious that when Allāh made Ādam His vicegerent, He endowed him with knowledge, and this fact proves the excellence of '*Ilm*. When a king or President of a country appoints his deputy, he generally stresses two points, via '*Ilm* (knowledge) and '*Amal* (Action). Ḥaḍrat Ādam was endowed with the qualities of enlightenment '*Ilm* on the one hand and practical devotion '*Amal* on the other.

As the Vicegerency *Khilāfat* of Allāh is the highest and most responsible mission, Allāh chooses, as His Apostles, such persons as are most qualified and most competent in every respect. Apostles' chief duty is to convey Allāh's orders to mankind and guide them on the straight path; it goes without saying that they cannot think of doing anything which conflicts with the commandments and prohibitions of the Supreme Being. They are innocent and cannot do wrong. Thus the point which distinguishes Apostles from all others (including angels) is the vast knowledge with which Allāh has endowed them.

Grades of knowledge

Knowledge has two grades, viz (i) that knowledge which precedes actions and which leads thereto, e. g., knowledge of elementary matters essential for prayers; and (ii) that knowledge which follows actions and which ultimately leads to the real knowledge of Allāh and His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) as the Holy Qur'ān points out in several places, e. g.

(O Ye who believe!) if ye keep your duty to Allāh, He will give you discrimination (between right and wrong). (Qur'ān 8:29)

إِنْ تَتَّقُوا اللّٰهَ يَجْعَلْ لَّكُمْ فُرْقَانًا (انفال، آیت ۲۹)

Allāh again says :

Observe your duty to Allāh, Allāh is teaching you. (Qur'ān 2:282)

اتَّقُوا اللّٰهَ وَيُعَلِّمُكُمُ اللّٰهُ (بقرہ، آیت ۲۸۲)

All Islamic injunctions are like medicines and knowledge; acquaintance and learning are like food for spiritual development and affirmation of truth. It is said that because '*Ilm* (knowledge) is a means of action, it must be inferior to '*Amal* (action). Now I meet this point. It is not correct to say that all sciences are sources of action, because some sciences are the results of action, to which Allāh has referred as *Taqwā* (Fear of Allāh). For this reason Allāh instructs His Apostle (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) to pray to Him in these words :-

And say: My Lord! increase me in knowledge. (Qur'ān 20:114)

وَقُلْ رَّبِّ زِدْنِيْ عِلْمًا۔ (طٰہٰ، آیت ۱۱۴)

For what kind of knowledge does Allāh order His Apostle to pray? Obviously, it cannot be that ordinary knowledge which is a source of action. It must be the fruit of continuous work in the way of Allāh. This know ledge of special kind was reserved for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

Excellence of Knowledge and Qur'anic verses mentioned by Bukhari

Under this chapter Imām Bukhārī could not find any *Ḥadīth* which could fulfil his conditions. Anyhow, he could quote this *Ḥadīth*:

"When a person travels in search of knowledge Allāh makes his way to Paradise very easy."

Imām Muslim also did not narrate any *Ḥadīth* which could come up to his standard. Bukhārī has simply quoted two verses of the Qur'ān (See above), the first of which clearly establishes the excellence of knowledge and the second also points to it, because the Final Apostle of Allāh, who was endowed with all kinds of knowledge and perfection was ordered by Allāh to pray for increase in knowledge. This fact proves the superiority and excellence of knowledge beyond measure. In the first named verse *Īmān* is mentioned first, afterwards *'Ilm* (knowledge). Imām Bukhārī has also followed the same order, viz, his "*Kitāb al-Īmān*" is followed by "*Kitāb al-'Ilm*". The verse also proves that *Īmān* and knowledge both have grades according to which the Believers and learned scholars have various ranks and positions.

'Ayni's and Sindhi's opinions regarding "قول"

'Allāmah Badruddīn 'Aynī is of the opinion that the word قول (statement) is here مجرور (i. e. the last letter of قول has كسره) and is connected with the word فضل going before. He says that the last letter of قول cannot have ضمه because it is neither a فاعل of any فعل nor خبر of any مبتدا. On the contrary, 'Allāmah Sindhī says that it is better that the word قول should be read as مرفوع and the original edition of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī has it as such. The passage will then read as follows: باب فضل العلم وفيه قول الله "Chapter on excellence of '*Ilm*'' and there is a statement of Allāh thereon.

بَابٌ 44 مَنْ سُئِلَ عِلْمًا وَّهُوَ مُشْتَغِلٌ فِيْ حَدِيْثِهٖ فَاَتَمَّ الْحَدِيْثَ ثُمَّ اَجَابَ السَّائِلَ۔

57. حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ سِنَانٍ قَالَ ثَنَا فُلَيْحٌ ح قَالَ وَحَدَّثَنِيْ اِبْرَاهِيْمُ بْنُ الْمُنْذِرِ قَالَ ثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ فُلَيْحٍ قَالَ ثَنَا اَبِيْ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِيْ هِلَالُ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ عَنْ عَطَاءِ بْنِ يَسَارٍ عَنْ اَبِيْ هُرَيْرَةَ قَالَ بَيْنَمَا النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِيْ مَجْلِسٍ يُحَدِّثُ الْقَوْمَ جَاءَهٗ اَعْرَابِيٌّ فَقَالَ مَتَى السَّاعَةُ فَمَضٰى رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يُحَدِّثُ فَقَالَ بَعْضُ الْقَوْمِ سَمِعَ مَا قَالَ فَكَرِهَ مَا قَالَ وَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ بَلْ لَمْ يَسْمَعْ حَتّٰى اِذَا قَضٰى حَدِيْثَهٗ قَالَ اَيْنَ اُرَاهُ السَّائِلُ عَنِ السَّاعَةِ قَالَ هَا اَنَا يَا رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ قَالَ فَاِذَا ضُيِّعَتِ الْاَمَانَةُ فَانْتَظِرِ السَّاعَةَ فَقَالَ كَيْفَ اِضَاعَتُهَا قَالَ اِذَا وُسِّدَ الْاَمْرُ اِلٰى غَيْرِ اَهْلِهٖ فَانْتَظِرِ السَّاعَةَ

CHAPTER XLIV

The person who is questioned about something while he is engaged in conversation finishes it first before he replies to the question.

57. We have been told by Muḥammad bin Sinān who said that he was informed by Fulayḥ—Another chain of transmitters: and Ibrāhīm bin al-Mundhir told me that he was informed by Muḥammad bin Fulayḥ who said: My father informed me that Hilāl bin 'Alī had told him, via 'Aṭā' bin Yasār, that the latter heard,

✶ Abū Hurayrah say:

"While the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) was addressing a gathering where a Bedouin came and asked him: When will the Day of Resurrection come? The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) continued his conversation. Some persons said that he (Apostle) heard what the Bedouin had said but did not like his question. Others said that he (Holy Prophet) had not heard it at all. When he finished his talk he said: Where is the man who questioned me about the Day of Resurrection?" He answered, "Here I am O Apostle of Allāh." Then he (Prophet) said: "When trust is violated, then await the Hour, Day of Resurrection". He asked, "How will it be violated?" The Prophet replied: "When administration of affairs is entrusted to unfit (disqualified) persons, then await the Hour."

While the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was talking to his followers, a villager (commonly called Bedouin) questioned him about the time of the Day of Resurrection. He did not pay heed to the questioner and continued his talk. Some people thought that he had heard the question but did not like it, and hence did not reply. Others thought that he had not heard it at all. Both the interpretations were wrong. The simple fact is that he was engaged in his discourse and did not think it proper to discontinue it. When he finished his discourse he replied to the said questioner.

قَالَ فَإِذَا ضُيِّعَتِ الْأَمَانَةُ فَانْتَظِرِ السَّاعَةَ The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said: When trust is violated one must wait for the Day of Resurrection. In other words when honesty, fairness and truthfulness disappear from the world, one must wait for Doomsday. The Bedouin's question is fully answered as follows:

قَالَ إِذَا وُسِّدَ الْأَمْرُ إِلَى غَيْرِ أَهْلِهِ فَانْتَظِرِ السَّاعَةَ He said: When the administration of affairs is entrusted to dishonest and incompetent persons, the Day of Resurrection should be awaited. The substance of the *Ḥadīth* is that unfit and disqualified persons cannot discharge their duties and fulfil their obligations satisfactorily. Now if such people are placed at the helm of affairs, there shall be complete chaos and disorder and normal work of the world will be upset. Consequently there will be a revolution which will point to the advent of the Doomsday. It may be added that administration of the world will go in the hands of unfit persons when knowledge and learning will disappear and ignorance will spread all over the world. In this way this *Ḥadīth* is included in *Kitāb al-'Ilm* (Book of Knowledge).

Explanations of the above

If any person asks questions during the time when one is engaged in conversation with other people, then one should continue if it is more important and urgent than question, as the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) did (see the *Ḥadīth*). If, however, the question is more urgent than conversation, one should answer the question first, as the Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) in course of his address on the pulpit replied to the question, "What is religion." So the nature of questions and occasions must be considered in all matters. The question regarding the definition of Islam is decidedly more important than the one regarding the advent of Doomsday.

Relevancy and Object

In the last chapter Bukhārī described the excellence of knowledge and of acquiring it in the light of the Qur'ānic verses. Now he tells the way how teachers and the taught must behave towards one another. A student must not interfere with the work of his teacher, and if a teacher does not answer any question for any reason he must not take it ill. It is within the discretion of a teacher to reply to a question immediately or after finishing the work in which he is engaged. This *Ḥadīth* alludes to the Qur'ānic verse:

> Lo! Allāh commandeth you that ye restore deposits to their owners.
>
> (Qur'ān 4:58)
>
> إِنَّ اللّٰهَ يَأْمُرُكُمْ أَنْ تُؤَدُّوا الْأَمٰنٰتِ إِلٰى
> أَهْلِهَا ۝ (نساء، آيت ۵۸)

CHAPTER XLV

The person who speaks loudly for imparting knowledge.

58. We have been told by Abul Nu'mān who said that he was informed by Abū 'Awānah, via Abī Bishr via Yūsuf bin Māhak via:

✱ 'Abdullāh bin 'Amr, that he (last) narrated:

"The Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) remained behind us in a journey (from Makkah to Madinah). The Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) met us when the time of 'Aṣr prayer had matured, and we were making ablution, in haste because the time of prayers was getting late. When we were rubbing our feet (with water) instead of washing them, the Prophet called us in loud voice and said twice or thrice, "Protect your heels from Fire".

بَابٌ 45 مَنْ رَفَعَ صَوْتَهُ بِالْعِلْمِ

58۔ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو النُّعْمَانِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو عَوَانَةَ عَنْ أَبِي بِشْرٍ عَنْ يُوسُفَ بْنِ مَاهَكَ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ عَمْرٍو قَالَ تَخَلَّفَ عَنَّا النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِي سَفْرَةٍ سَافَرْنَاهَا فَأَدْرَكَنَا وَقَدْ أَرْهَقَتْنَا الصَّلٰوةُ وَنَحْنُ نَتَوَضَّأُ فَجَعَلْنَا نَمْسَحُ عَلَى أَرْجُلِنَا فَنَادٰى بِأَعْلٰى صَوْتِهٖ وَيْلٌ لِلْأَعْقَابِ مِنَ النَّارِ مَرَّتَيْنِ أَوْ ثَلٰثًا

The substance of *Ḥadīth*

Yūsuf bin Māhak narrates from 'Abdullāh bin 'Amr that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) once remained behind his Companions in course of his journey. Meanwhile, time for the 'Aṣr prayer came, and they began to make ablution quickly and in so doing part of the heels remained dry. The Prophet noticed it and addressed them in a loud voice and said, "Save your heels from Fire."

Imām Ṭaḥāwī says that on account of haste some Muslims could not wash their feet properly and parts of their heels remained dry. Though they washed their feet in some way or the other, it looked as if they had rubbed their feet with water instead of washing them. Detailed information about the subject will be given in *Kitāb al-Wuḍū'*.

Relevancy and object of the *Ḥadīth*

In the preceding chapter it has been related that the teachers and the taught should behave towards one another with love and affection. There are occasions when some students ask unnecessary and undesirable questions, and teachers are required to answer them in a harsh language or loud voice. Imām Bukhārī means to say that speaking loudly is not forbidden in all cases. The Qur'ānic verse "لاترفعوا اصواتكم فوق صوت النبى" (i. e. lift not up your voices above the voice of the Prophet). (Qur'ān 49:2) does not imply that even in cases of urgency, speaking in loud voice is forbidden. Necessity and urgency sometimes demand that teachers and preachers must lift up their voices in order to make them reach the audience far and near.

Imām Muslim has narrated the following *Ḥadīth* from Jābir.

When the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) preached and made mention of the Day of Resurrection, his temper was hot, his voice was loud and his neck appeared swelling.[1]

إِذَا خَطَبَ وَذَكَرَ السَّاعَةَ اِشْتَدَّ غَضَبُهٗ وَعَلَا صَوْتُهٗ وَانْتَفَخَتْ أَوْدَاجُهٗ (حديث جابرؓ اخرجه مسلم)

Ibn 'Uyaynah says:

I passed by Abū Ḥanīfah (May Allāh be pleased with him) and he was engaged in conversation with his companions, and all of them raised their voices (in literary discussion).[2]

مَرَرْتُ بِأَبِي حَنِيْفَةَ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ وَهُوَ مَعَ أَصْحَابِهٖ وَقَدِ ارْتَفَعَتْ أَصْوَاتُهُمْ بِالْعِلْمِ

---

[1] This *Ḥadīth* allows the lifting up of voice on the occasion of literary discussions or dialogues. [2] Vide Sharḥi Bukhārī of *Kirmānī* Vol. II page 8. 'Abdur Raḥmān

In short, Imām Bukhārī has proved by this chapter that voices must be lifted up in cases of necessity as the expression, "فنادى باعلى صوته" (He called with loud voice) clearly proves it.

Shāh Walīullāh, the well-known Muḥaddith of Delhi says that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) never made a noise, but this *Ḥadīth* clearly indicates that, in time of necessity, he raised his voice for imparting knowledge to the people. Shaykh al-Hind says that it was below the dignity of the Messenger of Allāh to lift up his voice beyond the scope of necessity. So if any teacher raises his voice unnecessarily it is objectionable. Imām Bukhārī has mentioned this chapter in order to prove that if voices are raised in exceptional cases it would be neither below the dignity of the Apostle of Allāh nor unworthy of literary discourse. The Messenger of Allāh said the same words twice or thrice loudly, which shows that if the matter is urgent and important, voices may be lifted up.

CHAPTER XLVI

Al-Muḥaddith says (He told us), (He informed us), and (He said to us or informed us). **Imām Ḥumaydī says that according to Sufyān bin 'Uyaynah the words, "He told us", "He informed us", "He said to us or informed us" and "I heard" convey the same meaning. Ibn Mas'ūd said: "The Apostle of Allāh** (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) **told us and he was himself truthful and his saying was also truthful."** Shaqīq heard it from 'Abdullāh bin Mas'ūd who narrated that he heard the Holy Prophet say so. And Ḥudhayfah said: "The Messenger of Allāh related two *Aḥadīth* to us." Abul 'Āliyah said that Ibn 'Abbās had heard the Apostle of Allāh narrate what Allāh had told him. Anas heard from the Holy Prophet and the Prophet from Allāh. Abū Hurayrah heard from the Apostle, and Apostle from Allāh, the Most Blessed and Exalted.

59 We have been told by Qutaybah Sa'īd who said that he was informed by Ismā'īl bin Ja'far via 'Abdullāh bin Dīnār via:

✠ 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar that he (last narrator) heard,

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say:

"Verily among trees there is one tree the leaves of which do not fall (on the earth) and it is like a Muslim. Tell me what that tree is". The people began to think of the trees that were found in the desert. I (Ibn 'Umar) thought that it was palm tree but I felt shy to say so. Then the people asked, "What is that, O Messenger of Allāh?" "It is palm tree," replied the Prophet.

بَابٌ 46 قَوْلِ الْمُحَدِّثِ حَدَّثَنَا أَوْ أَخْبَرَنَا
وَأَنْبَأَنَا وَقَالَ الْحُمَيْدِيُّ كَانَ عِنْدَ ابْنِ عُيَيْنَةَ
حَدَّثَنَا وَأَخْبَرَنَا وَأَنْبَأَنَا وَسَمِعْتُ وَاحِدًا وَقَالَ
بْنُ مَسْعُودٍ حَدَّثَنَا رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ وَهُوَ الصَّادِقُ الْمَصْدُوقُ وَقَالَ شَقِيقٌ
عَنْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ سَمِعْتُ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
كَلِمَةً كَذَا وَقَالَ حُذَيْفَةُ حَدَّثَنَا رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ
صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حَدِيثَيْنِ وَقَالَ أَبُو الْعَالِيَةِ
عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِيمَا
يَرْوِي عَنْ رَبِّهِ وَقَالَ أَنَسٌ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ يَرْوِيهِ عَنْ رَبِّهِ وَقَالَ أَبُو هُرَيْرَةَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ
صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَرْوِيهِ عَنْ رَبِّكُمْ تَبَارَكَ
وَتَعَالَى ۞

59 - حَدَّثَنَا قُتَيْبَةُ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا
إِسْمٰعِيلُ بْنُ جَعْفَرٍ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ دِينَارٍ عَنِ
بْنِ عُمَرَ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
إِنَّ مِنَ الشَّجَرِ شَجَرَةً لَا يَسْقُطُ وَرَقُهَا وَإِنَّهَا مَثَلُ
الْمُسْلِمِ فَحَدِّثُونِي مَا هِيَ فَوَقَعَ النَّاسُ فِي شَجَرِ
الْبَوَادِي قَالَ عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ وَوَقَعَ فِي نَفْسِي أَنَّهَا النَّخْلَةُ
فَاسْتَحْيَيْتُ ثُمَّ قَالُوا حَدِّثْنَا مَا هِيَ يَا رَسُولَ اللّٰهِ
قَالَ هِيَ النَّخْلَةُ ۞

Aḥādīth about *'Ilm* (Knowledge) and matters relating thereto have been already mentioned earlier. Now, Ibn Rashīd says that Imām Bukhārī's purpose by the present chapter i. e. (قول المحدث الخ) is to show that he has based his entire book (*Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*) on these *Aḥadīth* only which have been transmitted from the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) Further, Imām Ṣāḥib warns that the chain of transmitters (سلسلة الاسناد) is really a touch stone to test the genuineness or otherwise of *Aḥādīth*. In respect of *Aḥādīth* one cannot be allowed to say what one wishes to say without *Isnād* (lines of narrators). We cannot distinguish between correct and false *Aḥādīth* without the aid of Isnād, and so Isnād is absolutely necessary for every ***Ḥadīth***. Isnād is part of religion, and if it is ignored, one would like to talk at random.

Different ways of narrating *Aḥādīth*:

There are different ways of acquiring *Aḥādīth*, and for narrating them from Shaykh (teacher) to other people different words are used, such as, انبأنا، اخبرنا، حدثنا and سمعت. Now the question is: whether all these words convey the same meaning and they can be used for one another, or each word has specific significance and one cannot be used for the other. Imām Bukhārī is of the opinion that all these words signify the same thing but in respect of the word عن meeting between the narrator and the person from whom ***Ḥadīth*** is obtained is necessary according to Bukhārī. Early ***Muḥaddithīn*** (Traditionists) generally favoured this opinion. Literally also these words bear the same meaning. Imām Muslim differentiates between حدثنا and اخبرنا and says, "It is not permissible to use حدثنا unless one hears *Ḥadīth* direct from one's teacher. If one has read with any teacher then in narrating ***Ḥadīth*** he will use the word اخبرنا". This difference, however, is merely technical. Imām Shāfi'ī, Ibn Jarīḥ, Auzā'ī, Ibn Wahb, Nisā'ī and majority of scholars of ***Ḥadīth*** hold the aforesaid view.

Different ways of acquiring *Ḥadīth*

There are different ways of acquiring ***Aḥādīth***, as under:

(i) A teacher reads and his pupils listen to him.

(ii) A pupil reads and his teacher listens to him.

(iii) Neither does a teacher read nor his pupil, but a teacher personally permits his pupil to narrate such and such *Aḥādīth* or narrate from such and such books on his behalf.

(iv) A teacher delivers a book to his pupil and says: I have heard such and such *Aḥādīth* from such and such persons or that this book is my own (i. e. compiled by me), and you may narrate on my behalf the ***Aḥādīth*** mentioned therein.

(v) A student is absent and his teacher sends him some ***Aḥādīth*** in writing.

(vi) A pupil is absent and his teacher did not give him anything in writing, but he despatched some *Aḥādīth* to him through a third person, directing him to read those ***Aḥādīth*** to his pupils on his behalf.

(vii) In the absence of the above, when we get a book of ***Ḥadīth*** from any source, we narrate ***Aḥādīth*** on the authority of the compiler of that book, as it is generally done nowadays.

These different forms of acquiring *Aḥādīth* are named respectively as follows:

(i) سمعت-قراءة الشيخ (I heard) or حدثنا (He told us) is used. Some scholars say that if a pupil is one حدثنی will be used, and if more, حدثنا will be used. But there is no hard and fast rule, because in 'Arabic language the two words are often used for each other.

(ii) قراءة على الشيخ (also called عرض على الشيخ). Imām Bukhārī will discuss this point in a separate chapter and will justify it on the basis of a *Ḥadīth* by Ḍimām bin Tha'labah. For this اخبرنی (if the pupil is one) or اخبرنا (if there are more pupils than one) is used.

(iii) انبئنی-اجازت (in case of one pupil) or انبأنا (in case of more pupils than one) is used.

(iv) مناولة (exchange of books of knowledge) Bukhārī will discuss this point also in a separate chapter in order to justify it. In narrating such *Aḥādīh* the word مناولة must be added.

(v) کتابت و مکاتبت (Writing of learned discourse for different places) Imām Bukhārī will touch on this point also in his chapter on مناولة. When a scholar of a place writes to a scholar of another place about any literary or religious matter, he must write کتب الی فلان (i. e. he wrote to me) or use an expression indicating that some body has written to some body (e. g. حدثنا فلان مکاتبة). Some scholars say that it is permissible to use حدثنا or اخبرنا without mentioning مکاتبة. But the first view is more correct.

(vi) رسالة و مراسلة It is like مکاتبة (see above). Here ارسل الی فلان (i. e. He sent me something) is generally used.

(vii) وجادة (e. g., I found this thing in the book or letter of such and such person).

Further, these seven forms of acquiring *Aḥādīth* have certain conditions, which determine what *Aḥādīth* are genuine and what are not. In respect of the word اخبرنا (He informed us) the following verse of the Qur'ān may be referred to "That day she (the Earth) will relate her chronicles" (Qur'ān 99:4). For the word انبأنا (He said to us or informed us) the followieg verse of the Qur'ān may be alluded to:

None can inform you like Him Who is Aware. (Qur'ān, 35:14)	يُنَبِّئُكَ مِثْلُ خَبِيرٍ (فاطر، آيت ١٤)

قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ إِنَّ مِنَ الشَّجَرِ شَجَرَةً لَا يَسْقُطُ وَرَقُهَا وَإِنَّهَا مَثَلُ الْمُسْلِمِ

The Messenger of Allāh (صلی الله علیه وسلم) said: "Indeed among trees there is one tree the leaves of which do not fall (on the earth) and it is like a Muslim. The Apostle of Allāh compared a Muslim with a tree and asked his Companions to name that tree. They started thinking of the trees of the desert. Ibn 'Umar says that he thought of palm tree but out of modesty he did not express it. Then the Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) announced "That tree is palm tree".

Relevance of *Ḥādīth* and its subject-matter

Imām Bukhārī seeks to prove his point on the basis of this *Ḥadīth*, as under:

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسام) is like Shaykh (teacher) and his companions are like his pupils. The expressions فحدثونی ماھی (Tell me what it is)" فحدثنا (He told us) point to the first two kinds of acquiring knowledge, Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib says that Bukhārī likes to prove that different words indicating various versions of this *Ḥadīth* are combined here e. g. فحدثونی according to the narration of 'Abdullāh bin Dīnār, "اخبرونی" according to the narration of *Nāfi' in Kitāb al-Tafsīr*, انبؤنی according to narration of Ismā'īlī, and اخبرنابہا according to Mālik (in the chapter on "modesty in knowledge").

Comparison of a Muslim with palm tree

The Messenger of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) compared a Muslim with palm tree. Now, what is the basis of comparison.? This is explained in several ways. Some scholars say that if the upper part of a tree is cut off it fades and withers so also a man dies if his head is cut off. But this explanation is not convincing, because it applies to entire mankind, not Muslims alone. Some persons say that just as man and woman have sexual tendency, so also has palm-tree. Here also the same objection arises. Some people think that palm tree was made of that clay of which Ḥadrat Ādam was created. Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib says that this sort of interpretation is absurd.

It must be noted that the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) has compared a Muslim (not any man) with palm tree. The main point of comparison is that this tree is as useful and beneficial as a true Muslim is. It may be said that some trees are more useful than palm tree. But it must be borne in mind that similie or comparison between two things or persons describes resemblance between the two—the extent of resemblance is out of question. For example, when we say that so and so is as daring and bold as a lion, we do not necessarily mean that no other animal of the world is more daring and bold than a lion. Similarly, a Muslim (if he is true and sincere) is as beneficial as palm tree (it does not matter whether other trees are more or less beneficial). لایسقط ورقها (The leaves of palm tree do not fall). This is also a similie. The idea is that a true Muslim's prayers never go in vain. Allāh is gracious enough to accept His servants' sincere prayers in one form or the other, sooner or later. If acceptance of certain prayers is delayed, it does not mean that they have been rejected. Hence it is called الدعاء مخ العبادة i. e. prayer is the brain (or essence) *'Ibādat* (worship).

The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is reported to have recited the following verse (at the time when he asked his Companions about the name of the tree the leaves of which do not fall).

Seest thou not how Allāh coineth a similitude: A goodly saying, as a goodly tree, its root set firm, its branches reaching into heaven. (Qur'ān, 14:24)

أَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ ضَرَبَ اللّٰهُ مَثَلًا كَلِمَةً طَيِّبَةً كَشَجَرَةٍ
طَيِّبَةٍ أَصْلُهَا ثَابِتٌ وَّفَرْعُهَا فِي السَّمَآءِ (ابراہیم، آیت ۲۴)

Many commentators of the Qur'ān are of the opinion that the tree in the verse refers to palm tree. This verse indicates that just as the root of palm tree set firm on the ground and its branches go up to the heaven, so also a Believer's *Īmān* is firm in his heart and his deeds, which are like branches, reach into heavens:

CHAPTER XLVII

A teacher puts some questions to his pupils in order to test their knowledge.

60. We have been told by Khālid bin Makhlad who said that he was informed by Sulaymān bin Bilāl that 'Abdullāh bin Dīnār had said to him via :

✶ 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar that the latter heard,

The Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) say :

"Indeed, there is a tree among trees the leaves of which do not fall (on the earth) and it is like a Muslim. Tell me what is that tree?"

The people began to think of the trees of the desert. I (Ibn 'Umar) thought that it was palm-tree, but I felt shy to say so. Then the people asked, "What is that O Messenger of Allāh?" "It is palm tree" replied the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).

بَابُ 47 طَرْحِ الْإِمَامِ الْمَسْئَلَةَ عَلَى أَصْحَابِهِ لِيَخْتَبِرَ مَا عِنْدَهُمْ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ ؛

60 حَدَّثَنَا خَالِدُ بْنُ مَخْلَدٍ قَالَ ثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ بْنُ بِلَالٍ قَالَ ثَنَا عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ بْنُ دِينَارٍ عَنِ ابْنِ عُمَرَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ إِنَّ مِنَ الشَّجَرِ شَجَرَةً لَا يَسْقُطُ وَرَقُهَا وَإِنَّهَا مَثَلُ الْمُسْلِمِ حَدِّثُونِي مَا هِيَ قَالَ فَوَقَعَ النَّاسُ فِي شَجَرِ الْبَوَادِي قَالَ عَبْدُ اللّٰهِ فَوَقَعَ فِي نَفْسِي أَنَّهَا النَّخْلَةُ فَاسْتَحْيَيْتُ ثُمَّ قَالُوا حَدِّثْنَا مَا هِيَ يَا رَسُولَ اللّٰهِ قَالَ هِيَ النَّخْلَةُ ؛

ليختبرای ليمتحن الاختبار وهوالامتحان To test knowledge. Imām Bukhārī has narrated the same *Ḥadīth* from the same Companion in the last and this chapter. He repeated the *Ḥadīth* because there is some variation in its subject-matter. There is slight difference in the *Matn* (text) also, i. e., in the last chapter "فحدثونی" with ف and in this chapter without ف has been used. In some editions of the book, "ف" has been used in both cases. Ḥāfiẓ Badruddīn 'Aynī and Kirmānī say that ف in this case is not necessary, because there is no connection between the two sentences. As regards ف in the last chapter, it is justified on the supposition that the verb in the sentences is in the subjunctive mood. Then the passage will read: ان عرفتموها فحدثونی i. e., if you know it, then inform me. Thus Imām Bukhārī has repeated this *Ḥadīth* in consideration of the subject matter. The question is: why did he make change in the chain of transmitters? Kirmānī says that in the last chapter Bukhārī has simply narrated a *Ḥadīth* and in this chapter he is referring to questions and answers in order to test the knowledge of students. Further, Bukhārī makes mention of his teachers on different occasions, and very often narrates the same *Ḥadīth* from his several teachers.

Relevancy and object

Bukhārī has said in the last chapter that the real criterion of genuine *Aḥādīth* is *Isnād* (Chain of transmitters). If the chain is reliable and trustworthy, the *Ḥadīth* will be accepted as correct, otherwise not. Now Bukhārī says that teachers must examine pupils occasionally in order to keep them fully aware of what was being taught. The Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) also tested the Companions' knowledge by putting a question to them. The meaning of the *Ḥadīth* نهی عن الاغلوطات is that unnecessary or undesirable questions must not be asked. Intelligent and useful questions are not disallowed—nay, these are encouraged so that the knowledge of pupils may increase slowly but steadily. Further, teachers must not ask such questions as are beyond the scope of the pupils to answer. Teachers are expected to give some hints in course of their questions so that the pupils may be able to answer them correctly. For example, the Holy Prophet (صلی الله علیه وسلم) in course of his question added "لایسقط ورقها" "Its leaves do not fall." In some versions of this *Ḥadīth* a sentence لاینقطع نفعها "Its benefits do not cease" is added, and this is also helpful for the pupils in giving answers.

The substance of *Ḥadīth*

From this ***Ḥadīth*** it also transpires that on some occasions junior or young persons hit at certain points correctly, whereas senior and aged people do not. For example, according to this ***Ḥadīth*** senior and old Companions did not know the correct answer of the Holy Prophet's question but a comparatively young man Ibn 'Umar hit at the right answer, though, out of his modesty he did not express it. At that time the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) read the following verse of the Qur'ān: "Seest thou not how Allāh coineth a similitude: A goodly saying, as a goodly tree, its root set firm, its branches reaching into heaven." (Qur'ān 14:24)

From this verse Ibn 'Umar intelligently inferred that "palm tree" was the appropriate answer to the Prophet's question.

This ***Ḥadīth*** also teaches us that youngsters must respect elders, and in course of studies they must not try to lift up their voice against that of the latter. Silence out of modesty is a commendable quality, (as Ibn 'Umar remained silent though he had hit at the right answer), but not in all cases. This is why Ḥadrat 'Umar regretted his son's silence on that occasion and wished that he had expressed what he had in his mind which could procure the Apostle's pleasure and good wishes for him and for his family.

CHAPTER XLVIII

A pupil reads and submits before his teacher. Imām Ḥasan Baṣrī, Sufyān Thaurī and Mālik allow it (viz reading of a pupil before his teacher). Some of them support it on the basis of the *Ḥadīth* of Dimān bin Tha'labah to the effect that he told the Holy Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*), "Has Allāh commanded you that we must establish prayers" "Yes" was the Prophet's reply. This fact looks as if, a pupil reads before his teacher. Then Ḍimām conveyed this information to his people who approved it. Imām Mālik says that if the contents of a document are read by one person to another and there is a witness for the document, it will be as good as a pupil reads something before his teacher and tells him that so and so read it to him earlier.

61. We have been told by Muḥammad bin Salām who said that he was informed by Muḥammad bin al-Ḥasan al-Wāsiṭī, via 'Auf that Imām Ḥasan Basrī said, "There is no objection to reading before a teaeher".

And we have been told by 'Ubaydullāh bin Mūsā that Sufyān Thaurī said: There is no objection if a pupil reads to the teacher and says: "A certain person narrated it to me" I heard Abū 'Āṣim relate the views of Imām Mālik and Sufyān Thaurī, i.e. whether a pupil reads before a teacher or a teacher reads before a pupil, both are equal.

بَابٌ 48 الْقِرَاءَةُ وَالْعَرْضُ عَلَى الْمُحَدِّثِ
وَرَأَى الْحَسَنُ وَالثَّوْرِيُّ وَمَالِكٌ الْقِرَاءَةَ جَائِزَةً
وَّاحْتَجَّ بَعْضُهُمْ فِي الْقِرَاءَةِ عَلَى الْعَالِمِ بِحَدِيثِ
ضِمَامِ بْنِ ثَعْلَبَةَ أَنَّهُ قَالَ لِلنَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ آللّٰهُ أَمَرَكَ أَنْ تُصَلِّيَ الصَّلٰوةَ قَالَ نَعَمْ
قَالَ فَهٰذِهٖ قِرَاءَةٌ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
أَخْبَرَ ضِمَامٌ قَوْمَهُ بِذٰلِكَ فَأَجَازُوهُ وَاحْتَجَّ مَالِكٌ
بِالصَّكِّ يُقْرَأُ عَلَى الْقَوْمِ فَيَقُولُونَ أَشْهَدَنَا فُلَانٌ
وَيُقْرَأُ ذٰلِكَ قِرَاءَةً عَلَيْهِمْ وَيُقْرَأُ عَلَى الْمُقْرِي
فَيَقُولُ الْقَارِئُ أَقْرَأَنِي فُلَانٌ ؛

61. حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ سَلَامٍ قَالَ ثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ
بْنُ الْحَسَنِ الْوَاسِطِيُّ عَنْ عَوْفٍ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ قَالَ
لَا بَأْسَ بِالْقِرَاءَةِ عَلَى الْعَالِمِ وَحَدَّثَنَا عُبَيْدُ اللّٰهِ
بْنُ مُوسٰى عَنْ سُفْيَانَ قَالَ إِذَا قُرِئَ عَلَى الْمُحَدِّثِ
فَلَا بَأْسَ أَنْ يَّقُولَ حَدَّثَنِي قَالَ وَسَمِعْتُ أَبَا عَاصِمٍ
يَقُولُ عَنْ مَّالِكٍ وَّسُفْيَانَ الْقِرَاءَةُ عَلَى الْعَالِمِ وَ
قِرَاءَتُهُ سَوَاءٌ ؛

واحتج بعضهم (Some of them argued). It is said that this refers to Abū Sa'īd al-Ḥaddād, one of the teachers of Imām Bukhārī. But Ḥumaydī says that it is not correct, and this mistaken view is due to the fact that Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar had previously written so in his *Muqaddamah* (preface) of *Fatḥ al-Bārī* and later explained the point by saying: "I had previously written so in the *Muqaddamah* but later I knew from Bayhaqī's book *Ma'rifat al-Sunan wal Āthār* that the aforesaid view was mentioned in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* itself.

Imām Bukhārī holds that according to Ḥasan Baṣrī, Sufyān and Imām Mālik, 'reading before teacher is permissible.' Bukhārī's teacher, Ḥumaydī supports his view on the basis of the *Ḥadīth* of Ḍimām bin Tha'labah, i. e. when he described what he knew before, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) approved it by saying "yes"; and when Ḍimām mentioned it to his people they accepted it. This proves the claim that "reading before teacher" is neither inferior to "Hearing from teacher nor less reliable than that". Had it been so, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) would not have simply said "yes"; he would have rather elaborated it clearly.

Mālik احْتَجَّ مَالِكٌ بِالصَّكِّ يُقْرَأُ عَلَى الْقَوْمِ فَيَقُوْلُوْنَ اَشْهَدَنَا فُلَانٌ وَيُقْرَأُ ذَالِكَ قِرَاءَةً عَلَيْهِمْ argued on the basis of a document which is read to the people. Though it is said that so and so is a witness, the fact is that the document is only read before the people. Imām Mālik has advanced some arguments in favour of reading before teacher, and Imām Bukhārī has described two of them. (i) Argument by document. A person read a document before the claimant concerned and witness, and the claimant confessed before the witness that the document was his own. In this way his claim is established. For example, 'Umar borrowed some money from Khālid and the scribe wrote the amount of debt, period of repayment, etc., in the document, and the scribe read the contents of the document regarding the creditor and debtor before two witnesses. Then both the parties concerned accepted the document as valid, though neither of them read it before the witnesses. As in the court of law, this sort of evidence is generally accepted, so also "reading before teacher" should be accepted as a genuine method of narrating *Aḥādīth*.

The pupil reads before his "ویقرأ علی فیقول القاری اقرأنی فلاں" teacher and says: "So and so read it before me". The second argument of Imām Mālik is this: A pupil reads the Qur'ān before his teacher who, after hearing it, approves it. Though the pupil says that so and so taught him the Qur'ān, the fact is that he himself read it to his teacher. Similar is the case of the pupil reading *Ḥadīth* before his teacher.

Imām Mālik seldom read *Aḥādīth* himself, and generally directed his pupils to read them before him. He would often say: "If the Qur'ān is read before you and you approve it, why do you not approve the *Aḥādīth* which are read before you?". Imām Muḥammad was fortunate enough to hear five hundred *Aḥādīth* direct from Imām Mālik. Muṭraf says that he remained with Imām Mālik for seventeen years and always observed that his pupils used to read *Aḥādīth* before him. Imām Bukhārī regarded "reading of the teacher" and "reading before the teacher" equal. The correct view, however, is that if a teacher relates something from his memory without the aid of the book, then تحدیث (*Taḥdīth*) is preferable otherwise قراءۃ (*Qirā'at*) and عرض (*'Arḍ*) will be preferable.

62. We have been told by 'Abdullāh bin Yūsuf who said that he was informed by Layth, via Sa'īd al-Maqburī, via Sharīk bin 'Abdullāh bin Abī Namir that he (the last narrator) heard,

* Anns bin Mālik say:

We were sitting in the mosque with the Holy Prophet (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) when a man came on a camel. He made it kneel down in the mosque and tied its legs. He then said, "Among you, who is Muḥammad?" While he was sitting among us reclining on his arms, we said: "This white man leaning on his arms." Then that man addressed him saying, "O son of 'Abdul Muṭṭalib." The Apostle (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) replied, "Speak, I am listening to you." He then said to the Prophet: I shall ask you some questions and my tone may be harsh. I hope you will not mind it." The Apostle said, "Ask what you desire to ask". The man said, 'By your Lord and the Lord of those who preceded you', I ask you, "Has Allāh sent you as His Apostle for entire mankind?" "By Allāh, yes," said the Apostle. Then the man told the Prophet, "By Allāh", I ask you: "Has Allāh commanded you to offer prayers five times a day?" "By Allāh, yes," replied the Prophet. The man further said, "By Allāh, I ask you if He has ordered you to fast this month of the year (i.e. *Ramaḍān*)." "By Allāh, yes", said the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). The man again said: "By Allāh, I ask you if He has commanded you to collect *Zakāt* (poor-due) from the rich and distribute it among the poor." "By Allāh, yes," said the Apostle of Allāh.

Then the man declared, "I believed in all the commandments which Allāh has given you, and I am a representative of my people who have remained behind. I am Ḍimām bin Tha'labah, brother of Banī Sa'd bin Bakr." Like Layth, Mūsā and 'Alī bin 'Abdul Ḥamīd narrated this *Ḥadīth* via Sulaymān via Thābit via Anas via the Apostle of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).

62 - حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللهِ بْنُ يُوسُفَ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا اللَّيْثُ عَنْ سَعِيدٍ هُوَ الْمَقْبُرِيُّ عَنْ شَرِيكِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ أَبِي نَمِرٍ أَنَّهُ سَمِعَ أَنَسَ بْنَ مَالِكٍ يَقُولُ بَيْنَمَا نَحْنُ جُلُوسٌ مَعَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِي الْمَسْجِدِ دَخَلَ رَجُلٌ عَلَى جَمَلٍ فَأَنَاخَهُ فِي الْمَسْجِدِ ثُمَّ عَقَلَهُ ثُمَّ قَالَ أَيُّكُمْ مُحَمَّدٌ وَالنَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مُتَّكِئٌ بَيْنَ ظَهْرَانَيْهِمْ فَقُلْنَا هَذَا الرَّجُلُ الْأَبْيَضُ الْمُتَّكِئُ فَقَالَ لَهُ الرَّجُلُ يَا ابْنَ عَبْدِ الْمُطَّلِبِ فَقَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَدْ أَجَبْتُكَ فَقَالَ الرَّجُلُ إِنِّي سَائِلُكَ فَمُشَدِّدٌ عَلَيْكَ فِي الْمَسْأَلَةِ فَلَا تَجِدْ عَلَيَّ فِي نَفْسِكَ فَقَالَ سَلْ عَمَّا بَدَا لَكَ فَقَالَ أَسْأَلُكَ بِرَبِّكَ وَرَبِّ مَنْ قَبْلَكَ آللَّهُ أَرْسَلَكَ إِلَى النَّاسِ كُلِّهِمْ فَقَالَ اللَّهُمَّ نَعَمْ فَقَالَ أَنْشُدُكَ بِاللهِ آللَّهُ أَمَرَكَ أَنْ تُصَلِّيَ الصَّلَوَاتِ الْخَمْسَ فِي الْيَوْمِ وَاللَّيْلَةِ قَالَ اللَّهُمَّ نَعَمْ قَالَ أَنْشُدُكَ بِاللهِ آللَّهُ أَمَرَكَ أَنْ تَصُومَ هَذَا الشَّهْرَ مِنَ السَّنَةِ قَالَ اللَّهُمَّ نَعَمْ قَالَ أَنْشُدُكَ بِاللهِ آللَّهُ أَمَرَكَ أَنْ تَأْخُذَ هَذِهِ الصَّدَقَةَ مِنْ أَغْنِيَائِنَا فَتَقْسِمَهَا عَلَى فُقَرَائِنَا فَقَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اللَّهُمَّ نَعَمْ فَقَالَ الرَّجُلُ آمَنْتُ بِمَا جِئْتَ بِهِ وَأَنَا رَسُولُ مَنْ وَرَائِي مِنْ قَوْمِي وَأَنَا ضِمَامُ بْنُ ثَعْلَبَةَ أَخُو بَنِي سَعْدِ بْنِ بَكْرٍ رَوَاهُ مُوسَى وَعَلِيُّ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْحَمِيدِ عَنْ سُلَيْمَانَ عَنْ ثَابِتٍ عَنْ أَنَسٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بِهَذَا.

From the above *Ḥadīth* Imām Mālik has argued that the urine and dung of those animals, whose flesh it is lawful to eat, are not unclean. Otherwise the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would not have allowed the man to enter the mosque along with his camel. But this argument is fallacious. Abū Na'īm narrates that a person riding on a camel came up to the mosque, got it kneel down and tied its legs, and then he entered the mosque. So the camel remained outside the mosque. Again a *Ḥadīth* of Ibn 'Abbās, narrated in *Musnadi Aḥmad*, clearly says that the man made his camel kneel down outside the gate of the mosque and tied it, and then he entered the mosque. The expression, "ثم دخل" "then he entered", leaves no room for doubt that the man entered the mosque after having left the camel outside.

Moreover, the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) did not tolerate any person spitting in the mosque. How could he tolerate the mosque being profaned by the urine and dung of an animal?

He said to ثُمَّ قَالَ لَهُمْ أَيُّكُمْ مُحَمَّدٌ وَالنَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مُتَّكِئٌ بَيْنَ ظَهْرَانَيْهِمْ them, "Who is Muḥammad among you?" At that time he (The Prophet) (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was sitting among his companions reclining on his arms. According to some scholars Ḍimām bin Tha'labah had not accepted Islam before his visit to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), and therefore addressed him by his name. Other scholars say that he had already embraced Islam and came to Apostle as a representative of his people in order to enquire about the teachings of Islam. As he was a justic villager and did not know how to address a respectable person, he addressed the Apostle of Allāh by name (as the disbeliever used to do). The word ظهرا نيهم is a dual form of the dual of ظهر (meaning back) against the rules of 'Arabic grammar. This word indicates that many people were sitting together with their backs towards one another.

We then said: The white person, lean- فَقُلْنَا هٰذَا الرَّجُلُ الْأَبْيَضُ الْمُتَّكِئُ ing on his arms, is Muḥammad. In the *Ḥadīth* of Ḥārith bin 'Umar the word "اصفر" "meaning red" is used instead of "ابيض" "meaning white". Hence the appropriate translation of the word "ابيض" here will be white and red combined, i. e. he was really very handsome. (It may be noted that an unmixed whiteness is regarded to be a sign of disease). This view is supported by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar's statement in this chapter that he (Apostle of Allāh) was neither wholly white nor wholly red.

Then the فَقَالَ لَهُ الرَّجُلُ يَا ابْنَ عَبْدِ الْمُطَّلِبِ فَقَالَ لَهُ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَدْ أَجَبْتُكَ man addressed the Apostle as, "O son of 'Abdul Muṭṭalib". His address in this way was indicative of his respect for the Prophet. As the Final Apostle of Allāh he (Muḥammad) was the most distinguished person from the religious point of view, and as grandson of 'Abdul Muṭṭalib, (one of the most prominent personalities of 'Arabia during that period), he was an important figure from the worldly stand point also. In the battle of Ḥunayn, The Prophet is reported to have said about himself: "I am an Apostle of Allāh and it is not false. I am a son of 'Abdul Muṭṭalib."

قد اجبتک The Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) said: "I am here to answer your questions". In other words, he meant to say that his mission was to listen to what the people had to say to him and answer their questions. Some people say that the Apostle did not use the word نعم (meaning yes), because the man's mode of address was not up to the Apostle's dignity, as the Qur'ān says:

> Make not the calling of the Messenger among you as your calling one of another. (Qur'ān 24:63)
>
> لَا تَجْعَلُوا دُعَاءَ الرَّسُولِ بَيْنَكُمْ كَدُعَاءِ
> بَعْضِكُمْ بَعْضًا ؕ (نور، آیت ۶۳)

If Ḍimām addressed the Apostle of Allāh in that unusual way after having embraced Islam, it could be excused because he was a villager, far from the cultured life of a city, and possibly he was not aware of the Qur'ānic verse by that time. There is a *Ḥadīth* of Thābit via Anas to the effect, "We were forbidden in the Qur'ān to put questions to the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم)". For this reason, the Companions of the Apostle often liked that some villagers should come to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and ask him intelligent questions, so that they could also benefit by the Prophet's answer to those questions. Anyhow, Ḍimām was clever enough to crave the Prophet's indulgence before he actually put his questions to him.

He said : "I believed in what you have got اٰمَنْتُ بِمَا جِئْتَ بِهٖ from Allāh (i. e. I have already believed therein)." Imām Bukhārī maintains that Ḍimām came to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) after accepting Islam and hence he said, "I believed in what you have got from Allāh and I am a representative of my people who remained behind." Auza'ī supports this view, and Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ prefers it. Some scholars, however, say that Ḍimām was not Muslim when he met the Holy Prophet, (صلى الله عليه وسلم) because the word زعم in the sentence "زعم رسولك" (your messenger claimed) indicates that it is not certain that he had accepted Islam already. This argument is not convincing because this word (زعم) is often used in the sense of قال (he said). The fact that Ḍimām did not ask the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) any question about unity of Allāh or his miracles prove that he was already a Muslim.

There is no mention of *Ḥajj* in this *Ḥadīth*

In this *Ḥadīth*, *Ḥajj* (Pilgrimage) is not mentioned, but Ḍimām's *Ḥadīth*, as it is given in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and other books, includes *Ḥajj* also as under:

"And *Ḥajj* to the Ka'bah is a duty for us who find a way thither." Ibn al-Tīn is of the opinion that *Ḥajj* was not mentioned in the *Ḥadīth* because it was not made obligatory by that time. This opinion may possibly be based on the statement of Wāqidī and others who say that Ḍimām bin Tha'labah came to the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in 5 A. H. whereas *Ḥajj* (Pilgrimage) was made obligatory afterwards.

Ibn al-Tin, Waqidi and Ibn Hajar

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has refuted the statement of Ibn al-Tīn and Wāqidī on several grounds, viz.

(i) Here is a *Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* that Ḍimām bin Tha'labah came to the Prophet of Allāh after the revelation of the following verse of the *Sūrah al-Mā'idah*.

"O ye who believe! Ask not of things, which if they were made known unto you, would trouble you". (Qur'ān, 5:101)

How could Ḍimām come to Madīnah in the 5 A. H. when that *Sūrah* was revealed long after that period?

(ii) Ḍimām's saying, "Your messenger stated this to me", indicates that the event took place when delegates and messengers started coming to Madīnah, i. e. after the Treaty of Ḥudaybiah in 6 A. H. and conquest of Makkah in 8 A. H.

(iii) Ḍimām made mention of deputations, and it was in 9 A. H. that a series of deputations visited the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) at Madīnah.

Ḍimām bin Tha'labah's family was related to Banī Sa'd who were descended from the tribe of Hawāzin who embraced Islam in 8 A. H. after the battle of Ḥunayn.

(iv) The correct view is that Ḍimām came to Madīnah in 9 A.H. Muḥammad bin Isḥāq, Abū 'Ubaydah and others endorse this view. Al-Badr al-Żarkashī is mistaken when he says that *Ḥajj* (Pilgrimage) was not mentioned in the *Ḥadīth*, because the people had known it already as part of the religion of Prophet Abraham (may peace be on him).

Connection between *Ḥadīth* and subject-matter

Imām Bukhārī's theory about قراءة (reading) and عرض (submitting) is proved by this *Ḥadīth*. Ḍimām repeated what the Prophet's messenger told him and the Prophet approved it, and when he returned to his people they became Muslim.

63- حَدَّثَنَا مُوسَى بْنُ إِسْمٰعِيلَ قَالَ ثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ
بْنُ الْمُغِيرَةِ قَالَ ثَنَا ثَابِتٌ عَنْ أَنَسٍ قَالَ نُهِينَا فِي
الْقُرْاٰنِ أَنْ نَسْأَلَ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَكَانَ
يُعْجِبُنَا أَنْ يَجِيءَ الرَّجُلُ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْبَادِيَةِ الْعَاقِلُ
فَيَسْأَلَهُ وَنَحْنُ نَسْمَعُ فَجَاءَ رَجُلٌ مِّنْ أَهْلِ الْبَادِيَةِ
فَقَالَ أَتَانَا رَسُولُكَ فَأَخْبَرَنَا أَنَّكَ تَزْعُمُ أَنَّ اللهَ
عَزَّ وَجَلَّ أَرْسَلَكَ قَالَ صَدَقَ فَقَالَ فَمَنْ خَلَقَ السَّمَاءَ
قَالَ اللهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ قَالَ فَمَنْ خَلَقَ الْأَرْضَ وَالْجِبَالَ
قَالَ اللهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ قَالَ فَمَنْ جَعَلَ فِيهَا الْمَنَافِعَ قَالَ اللهُ
عَزَّ وَجَلَّ قَالَ فَبِالَّذِي خَلَقَ السَّمَاءَ وَخَلَقَ الْأَرْضَ
وَنَصَبَ الْجِبَالَ وَجَعَلَ فِيهَا الْمَنَافِعَ آللهُ أَرْسَلَكَ
قَالَ نَعَمْ قَالَ زَعَمَ رَسُولُكَ أَنَّ عَلَيْنَا خَمْسَ صَلَوَاتٍ
وَزَكٰوةً فِي أَمْوَالِنَا قَالَ صَدَقَ قَالَ بِالَّذِي أَرْسَلَكَ
آللهُ أَمَرَكَ بِهٰذَا قَالَ نَعَمْ قَالَ وَزَعَمَ رَسُولُكَ
أَنَّ عَلَيْنَا صَوْمَ شَهْرٍ فِي سَنَتِنَا قَالَ صَدَقَ قَالَ فَبِالَّذِي
أَرْسَلَكَ آللهُ أَمَرَكَ بِهٰذَا قَالَ نَعَمْ قَالَ وَزَعَمَ
رَسُولُكَ أَنَّ عَلَيْنَا حَجَّ الْبَيْتِ مَنِ اسْتَطَاعَ إِلَيْهِ
سَبِيلًا قَالَ صَدَقَ قَالَ فَبِالَّذِي أَرْسَلَكَ آللهُ أَمَرَكَ
بِهٰذَا قَالَ نَعَمْ قَالَ فَوَالَّذِي بَعَثَكَ بِالْحَقِّ لَا أَزِيدُ
عَلَيْهِنَّ شَيْئًا وَلَا أَنْقُصُ فَقَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ إِنْ صَدَقَ لَيَدْخُلَنَّ الْجَنَّةَ ؞

63. We have been told by Mūsā bin Ismā'il who said that he was informed by Sulaymān bin al-Mughīrah that Thabit had heard,

✶ Anas bin Malik say:

"We were forbidden in the Qur'ān to put questions to the Apostle of Allāh (*ṣallallāho alaihi wa sallam*) and so we wished that some villagers (who did not know it) should come and ask questions from the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) and we listen to them." At last a man came from a village and said to him, "your messenger came and told us that you say that Allāh has sent you (as His (Apostle)".

"He told the truth", was the Prophet's reply. The man then asked. "Who has created heaven?" "Allāh," was his reply- "Who has created the earth and mountains?" questioned the man. "Allāh", replied the Apostle (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). "Who has created beneficial things in mountains?" asked the man. "Allāh," was his reply. The man then said: "By Allāh, Who has created the heaven, the earth and set up mountain and placed useful things therein, has Allāh sent you (as His Messenger)?" "Yes", replied the Apostle (*sallallāho alaihi wa sallam*). The man then said, "Your messenger said that we must offer prayers five times a day and pay *zakāt* (poor-due) on our property." "He told the truth," said the Apostle (*sallallāho alaihi wa sallam*). The man then said, "By Allāh, Who has sent you, has Allāh given you all these orders?" "Yes", was his reply. The man then said, "Your messenger said that we must fast one month every year "He told the truth," replied the Prophet (*sallallāho alaihi wa sallam*). The man further said, "By Allāh, Who has sent you, has Allāh given you this command?" "Yes," was the Apostle's answer. The man then said, "Your messenger said that we must make Hajj (Pilgrimage) of the Ka'bah, i.e. those of us who can find a way thither." "He told the truth," said the Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*). Then the man said, "By Allāh, Who has sent you, has He given you this order?" "Yes," was the Prophets' reply.

The man then said, "By Allāh, Who has sent you with a mission of truth, neither shall I do more nor less than what you have ordered me to do." The Messenger of Allāh said, "If he is true to his words, he will certainly go to Paradise."

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has narrated the statement of Ṣan'ānī that this *Ḥadīth* is not found in all editions of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. This is found in that edition only, which Farbarī (a direct student of Imām Bukhārī) compiled. Anyhow, Bukhārī's view is proved by this *Ḥadīth* also, as Ḍimām bin Tha'labah repeated what the Prophet's messenger had told him and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) confirmed it. This shows that it is not necessary for a teacher to express or repeat the *Hadīth* with his tongue. It is sufficient that a student reads and his teacher approves what he reads. Thus قراءة (reading) and عرض (submission) both are reliable methods of relating *Ḥadīth*.

CHAPTER XLIX

Concerning exchange of knowledge and the scholars' writing of learned discourse for different places.

Anas says: Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān got the Qur'ān compiled and sent some copies thereof to different places. 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar, Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd Anṣārī and Mālik regard it (i.e. *Munāwalah*) quite permissible. Some people of Ḥijāz have endorsed the process of (*Munāwalah*) on the basis of a *Ḥadīh* of the Apostle of Allāh in which he wrote a letter to the Commander of an army and directed him not to read it until he reached such and such place. When he (Commander of the army) reached the place he read the letter before the people and apprised them of the instructions of the Apostle of Allāh (*sallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*).

بَابٌ 49 مَا يُذْكَرُ فِي الْمُنَاوَلَةِ وَكِتَابِ أَهْلِ
الْعِلْمِ بِالْعِلْمِ إِلَى الْبُلْدَانِ وَقَالَ أَنَسٌ نَسَخَ عُثْمَانُ
الْمَصَاحِفَ فَبَعَثَ بِهَا إِلَى الْآفَاقِ وَرَأَى عَبْدُ اللهِ
بْنُ عُمَرَ وَيَحْيَى بْنُ سَعِيدٍ وَمَالِكٌ ذٰلِكَ جَائِزًا وَاحْتَجَّ
بَعْضُ أَهْلِ الْحِجَازِ فِي الْمُنَاوَلَةِ بِحَدِيثِ النَّبِيِّ
صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حَيْثُ كَتَبَ لِأَمِيرِ السَّرِيَّةِ
كِتَابًا وَقَالَ لَا تَقْرَأْهُ حَتّٰى تَبْلُغَ مَكَانَ كَذَا وَكَذَا
فَلَمَّا بَلَغَ ذٰلِكَ الْمَكَانَ قَرَأَهُ عَلَى النَّاسِ وَأَخْبَرَهُمْ
بِأَمْرِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

Connection

Imām Bukhārī has described in these chapters several methods of obtaining *Aḥādīth* from a teacher. After describing two methods قراءة الشيخ (reading of a teacher) and قراءة على الشيخ (reading before a teacher), Bukhārī now mentions the process of مناولة which means that a teacher personally delivers a written thing to his pupil and permits him to narrate it. If a teacher sends a book to his pupil (not personally but through a third man) it is called مكاتبة. Some scholars say that the former is preferable to the latter because the teacher and the taught decide the matter face to face. Others say that the latter (مكاتبة) is better than the former (مناولة) because the teacher writes *Aḥādīth* for his pupils only (for none else).

Why has Bukhārī described "كتاب اهل العلم بالعلم" "The writing of learned discourse by scholars" immediately after "مناولة" "Exchange of Knowledge?" Shaykh al-Hind Mawlāna Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan is of the opinion that as Bukhārī has no clear argument in support of the technical term مناولة he has extended the scope of his reasoning in order to include similar matters therein. Bukhārī's first argument is that Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān got the Holy Qur'ān compiled and sent a few copies of it to various places, with the instruction that its copies should be made accordingly. Opinions differ regarding the number of the copies of the Qur'ān prepared by Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān. Some people say that 'Uthmān made five copies, of which he sent four to Ḥijaz, Baḥrayn, Yaman and Syriā, and kept one with himself. Abū 'Amr Dānī says that opinions are unanimous about four copies—three of which were despatched to Syriā, Baṣrah and Kūfah and one was kept for himself. Abū Ḥatim Sajistānī says that seven copies of the Qur'ān were made, of which six were sent to Makkah, Syriā, Baḥrayn, Baṣrah, Yaman and Kūfah. In short, when مكاتبة (writing of knowledge) is an approved process of acquiring knowledge in respect of the Holy Qur'ān, it is all the more so in respect of *Aḥādīth*. It must be borne in mind that all the verses of the Qur'ān were already collected and *Sūrās* named during the life time of the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and 'Uthmān only made their copies.

Here a question arises as to which script became the basis of the copies of the Qur'ān which Ḥaḍrat 'Uthman sent to ifferent Islamic countries. It is historically proved that whenever verses of the Qur'ān were revealed to the Holy Prophet, (صلى الله عليه وسلم) he directed his scribes to place verses of similar nature together in one *Sūrah*, (chapter) serially arranged and himself gave the name of each *Sūrah*. What Ḥaḍrat Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq did was that he collected verses of the Qur'ān which had been scattered in different places.

He arranged them in the way suggested by the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). What Ḥaḍrat 'Uthmān did was that he prepared a few copies of the Qur'ān which had already been compiled by Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq who sent them to different places in order to stop all kinds of confusion and misunderstandings. All the copies of the Qur'ān, with the Companions, as well as that one with Ḥafṣah, collected during the time of Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq, were called for. Accordingly, a body of Ḥuffāẓ (persons having the whole Qur'ān by heart), and Qur'ā (readers of the Qur'ān) was appointed and all the *Sūrās*, according to the recognised script of the Qur'ān, were set together and copies of the same script were sent to the different Islamic countries.

These three *Muḥaddithīn* وَرَاى عَبْدُاللهِ بْنُ عُمَرَ وَيَحْيَى ابْنُ سَعِيْدٍ وَمَالِكٌ ذٰلِكَ جَائِزًا (scholars of *Ḥadīth*) have approved مناولة (exchange of knowledge). Now the question is, "Who is 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar?" If he is a Companion of the Prophet, it is strange to find his name along with the names of other narrators. He may be عبد الله بن عمر عمرى who is a narrator of *Aḥādīth* at the lower level. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar and 'Allāmah Badruddīn 'Aynī differ on this question. In all editions of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* عبدالله بن عمر is written without the letter "و" and there is ضمه on the letter "ع" of 'Umar. It may, therefore, be either 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar al-Khaṭṭāb or 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar 'Umrī (great grandson of Ḥaḍrat 'Umar bin Khaṭṭāb). Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says, "I regarded 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar 'Umrī as a native of Madīnah, but Bukhārī has named him before Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd, which indicates that he was higher in rank and this is not correct". Further Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says, "I made researches but could not get any direct information on the subject." But Abul Qāsim bin Mandah mentions in the book "*Kitāb al-Waṣīyat*", a statement of 'Abdur Raḥmān Ḥubulī that he went to 'Abdullāh with a book of *Aḥādīth* and told him, "Please keep correct *Aḥādīth* here and omit the rest." As he named 'Abdullāh (without the name of his father) he could be 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar al-Khaṭṭāb or 'Abdullāh bin 'Amr bin al-'Āṣ. 'Abdur Raḥmān Ḥubulī has narrated *Aḥādīth* from both of them.

'Allāmah Badruddīn 'Aynī says that the fact that 'Abdur Raḥmān Ḥubulī has mentioned " 'Abdullāh only" indicates that 'Abdullāh bin Mas'ūd is intended here. (Not 'Abdullāh bin 'Amr bin al-'Āṣ, as the letter "و" is not mentioned after 'Amr). Mawlānā Sayyed Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī says that 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar 'Umrī is a narrator of *Aḥādīth* (to the level of Ḥasan). Imām Tirmīdhī has approved his *Ḥadīth* in the *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*. According to Imām Bukhārī also he is a reliable transmitter.

I am of the opinion that by 'Abdullāh here, 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar (a Companion) is meant, and it is not strange to mention him along with Yaḥyā bin Sa'īd and Imām Mālīk.

Some people of Ḥijāz have suppor- واحتج بعض اهل الحجاز فى المناولة ted the method of مناولة on the basis of *Ḥadīth* to the effect that the Holy Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) gave a letter to the commander of an army with the direction that he should open the letter at such and such place only and read its contents to the people there. By some people of Ḥijāz, "Ḥumaydī" is intended here. This *Ḥadīth* is briefly narrated here. The substance of the detailed *Aḥādīth* on the subject is that the Apostle of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) appointed 'Abdur Raḥmān bin Jaḥash (a younger brother of Zaynab, daughter of Jahash, one of the mothers of the Faithful) as a leader of a small group of Muslims and gave him a confidential letter with the direction that he should open the letter after two days and read its contents to his companions and act on the instructions contained in the letter, but not compel any person to act against his will. When he opened the letter at the suggested place he read that the Apostle (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had directed him and his party to ascertain the movements of the Quraysh in Nakhlah lying between Ṭā'if and Makkah. This event took place before the Battle of Badr in 2 A.H.

This *Ḥadīth* endorses the process of مناولة (Exchange of Knowledge), though technically it does not fullfil its conditions. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not read the contents of the letter before the people, he simply informed them by means of a letter, This *Ḥadīth* also supports مكاتبه (scholars' writing for different places).

64. We have been told by Ismā'il bin 'Abdullāh who said that he was informed by Ibrāhim bin Sa'id, via. Ṣāliḥ, via. Ibn Shihāb, via. 'Ubaydullāh bin 'Abdullāh bin 'Utbah bin Mas'ūd that:

✶ 'Abdullāh bin 'Abbās had told him: "The Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāho alaihi wa sallam*) sent a man ('Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah) with a letter and commanded him to deliver it to the Ruler of Baḥrayn (and he did it) and the Ruler of Baḥrayn delivered it to the Khusrao Perwiz (Emperor of Persia). When the latter read the letter he tore it into pieces. The narrator (Ibn Shihāb) thinks that Ibn al-Musayyab said that the Holy Prophet (*sallalāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) cursed the Persians, and prayed that Allāh might tear them into pieces, likewise.

64- حَدَّثَنَا إِسْمٰعِيْلُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِيْ
إِبْرٰهِيْمُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ عَنْ صَالِحٍ عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ عَنْ
عُبَيْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللّٰهِ بْنِ عُتْبَةَ بْنِ مَسْعُوْدٍ أَنَّ
عَبْدَ اللّٰهِ بْنَ عَبَّاسٍ أَخْبَرَهٗ أَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَعَثَ بِكِتَابِهٖ رَجُلًا وَّأَمَرَهٗ أَنْ يَّدْفَعَهٗ
إِلٰى عَظِيْمِ الْبَحْرَيْنِ فَدَفَعَهٗ عَظِيْمُ الْبَحْرَيْنِ إِلٰى
كِسْرٰى فَلَمَّا قَرَأَهٗ مَزَّقَهٗ فَحَسِبْتُ أَنَّ ابْنَ
الْمُسَيَّبِ قَالَ فَدَعَا عَلَيْهِمْ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَنْ يُّمَزَّقُوْا كُلَّ مُمَزَّقٍ

Imām Bukhārī narrated this *Ḥadīth* in support of his view.

أَنَّ رَسُوْلَ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَعَثَ بِكِتَابِهٖ رَجُلًا

By a man here 'Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah al-Sahmī is meant. After the Treaty of Ḥudaybīyah the Apostle of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) sent letters to several kings and rulers inviting them to accept Islam. Khusrao Perwiz, a grandson of Anūsherwān, was then Emperor of Persia. He tore into pieces the Prophet's letter. He cursed the Persians and prayed that Allāh might tear them into pieces likewise. For details the reader may refer to the *Ḥadīth* on Heracleus in the chapter on "Commencement or *Waḥī*" (Divine Inspiration).

Relevancy of *Ḥadīth* and subject-matter

The Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) gave a letter to 'Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah with the instructions that he must tell the Persian Emperor that the letter had been sent to him by the Prophet but the fact is that 'Abdullāh bin Ḥadhāfah neither read the letter nor knew its contents. This is an example of مناولة (Exchange of knowledge).

The connection of this *Ḥadīth* with the second part of the subject matter viz. كتاب اهل العلم بالعلم الى البلدان (Scholar's writing of knowledge for different places) is quite evident, but its connection with the first part thereof is not quite clear. Anyhow, Shāh Waliūllāh and Shaykh al-Hind both are of the opinion that when Imām Bukhārī finds it difficult to advance an argument for any matter, he brings arguments for similar matters. When connection of the second part of the subject with the *Ḥadīth* is proved the first part of the same may also be regarded as proved.

65. We have been told by Muḥammad bin Muqātil (nicknamed as Abul Ḥasan) who said that he was informed by 'Abdullah bin Mubārak that Shu'bah had told him via Qatādah that:

✠ Anas bin Malik narrated:

The Messenger of Allāh (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) once wrote a letter or intended to write a letter. They (the Companions) told him that they (rulers and kings) would not accept letters unless they were sealed. The Prophet (*ṣallallāho 'alaihi wa sallam*) then got a ring of silver with Muḥammad, Apostle of Allāh, engraved thereon. Anas said: It seems as if I am witnessing even now the whiteness of the ring in the Prophet's hand.

65۔ حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ مُقَاتِلٍ أَبُو الْحَسَنِ
قَالَ ثَنَا عَبْدُ اللهِ قَالَ أَخْبَرَنَا شُعْبَةُ عَنْ قَتَادَةَ
عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ قَالَ كَتَبَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَسَلَّمَ كِتَابًا أَوْ أَرَادَ أَنْ يَكْتُبَ فَقِيْلَ لَهُ إِنَّهُمْ لَا
يَقْرَءُوْنَ كِتَابًا إِلَّا مَخْتُوْمًا فَاتَّخَذَ خَاتَمًا مِّنْ فِضَّةٍ
نَقْشُهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُوْلُ اللهِ كَأَنِّيْ أَنْظُرُ إِلَى بَيَاضِهٖ فِيْ
يَدِهٖ فَقُلْتُ لِقَتَادَةَ مَنْ قَالَ نَقْشُهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُوْلُ
اللهِ قَالَ أَنَسٌ

Shu'bah said to Qatādah, "Who said that the name of the Prophet was engraved on the ring?" He replied, "Anas bin Mālik said so."

When the Messenger of Allāh (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) intended to write letters to the rulers of different places he was informed that unsealed letters were not accepted by distinguished persons. As the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) wished to write letters to rulers for preaching Islam, he got a silver ring on which the following words were engraved. Muḥammad in the first line, Rasūl in the second line, and Allāh in the third line. It is also said that the three words were engraved in the following order: Allāh in the first line, Rasūl in the second line and Muḥammad in the third line.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar says that Imām Bukhārī stresses the point that for communication of news to different places sealed letters or books must be sent, otherwise their contents would not be free from doubts and suspicions. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar also says that if the addressee recognises the writing of the writer and does not doubt any interpolation, then seals are not necessary. If the messenger of a letter or book is reliable, seals are not needed.

Relevancy of *Ḥadīth* and subject-matter

This *Ḥadīth* of Anas is quite relevant to the subject because the Prophet's intention to write letters to different rulers is mentioned here —and this proves the validity of مکاتبة (scholars' writing for the benefit of the people of different places). The Prophet (صلی اللہ علیه وسلم) did not go to the rulers personally for preaching Islam. If this process had been inferior to the مشافهة (face to face talk) he would not have adopted this method.

The End